

OR AN
 184 ESSAY
 Towards a
 CLEAR RESOLUTION
 OF
 Five seasonable Queries.

VIZ.

- I. *What* is it which may *warrant*, and acquit from *Schisms*, a Persons *Non-Communion* with the Church of England in, the *Worship* (alleged to be) ministered by *her Liturgy* or *Common-Prayer*?
- II. *What* is it which may *warrant*, and acquit from *Schisms*, a Persons *Non-Communion* with the Church of England, in the *Sacraments* of the *Lords Supper*, under the present *Mode, Manner* and *Method* of *Administration*?
- III. *Whether* the *Liturgy* of the Church of England, being (supposed to be) *Unlawful*, People may (yet) lawfully *communicate* in the *Service* or *Worship* (said to be) thereby exhibited?
- IV. *Whether* One may be lawfully *present* in time of *Common-Prayer*, who (yet) cannot lawfully *communicate* in, or by, it?
- Whether* the Oath called the *Solemn League and Covenant* (supposed to be (as yet) in *force*, and *Obligatory*) could oblige of *him* against *Communion* in *Common-Prayer*?

In *Defence* of the *Humble Remonstrance* to Mr. *Croftons Plea* for *Communion* &c. against the *Reply* (groundless) entitled,
Jerub-baal Justified.

Addressed by way of *Letter* to its *Authors own Impartial Examination*:
 By the *Truths* weakest *Advocate*, T. P.

Buy the Truth, and sell it not, Prov. 23. 23.

Id est Scriptura, Dei est Disciplina; Quicquid contrarium est illis, Dei non est.
 Tertul. de Virgin. v. c. and.

LONDON, Printed in the Year 1663.

An Essay towards the brief Resolution of Five seasonable Queries, addressed by way of Letter to the Impartial Examination of the Reverend R. S. alias, Z. C.

SIR,



THAT *The Sun of Righteousness* Himself, was once Eclipsed with Reproaches, is a Truth known to all that know any thing at all, of Gospel-History: And if Spotlesse Innocency be no Tongue-proof, well may I, with patience, wear, the Crown of Thorns, which you have platted. Your REBUKE then (though big-bellied with Satyirical Invektives, Slanders and Revilings, which (the World be Judge) would better become a *Shimei* than a *Levite*) I do in all meeknesse receive, as being (but) little skilled in *Rabshakeh's Dialect* (other then to suffer by it) and as loath (herein at least) *Cham-like*, to discover a *Fathers Nakednesse*. Why may not *Elijahs Zeal*, excuse his *Passion*? *Revenge* I am not studious of, being taught of God that to requite railing with railing ^{1 Pet. 3. 9.} were an *unchristian Retaliation*. O Sir! Let there be no strife between you and me (other then an *Amicable Contest* for the Truth) for (shall I say?) we be Brethren; or, if That be not Motive enough, remember — the *Canaanite* and *Perizzite*, dwell in the Land.

A 2

That

That my *Remembrance* should be by you charged with a (total) *mistake*, a *grosse mistake*! (a great *Stone* in your *Path*) is to me matter of wonder: and to whom can it appear other, who is but in the least acquainted either with the *Occasion*, or with the *Scope* and *Design* thereof? the One being administr'd by your own (first) *Censure* † and (then) *Challenge* * (about six *Weeks* before the publication of *Jerub-baal*) both enforced with such heat and importunity, as that nothing would satisfy, but that I must either *fight* or *yield*, turn either *Proselyte* or *Antagonist*. The Other being *avowed*, to defend and vindicate my *Non-Communion* with the Church of England in her *Common-Prayer* (that is the *Worship* exhibited by the *Liturgy*) from the *scandalous* blot and imputation of *Schism*, (which I hope is sufficiently done). I had for my own part (till that Occurrence) determin'd to lye *Dormant* in that dead *Capacity* into which *Providence* (putting my *dimm light under a bushell*) hath resolved me; free from the Intanglements of such unpleasant Controversies; and that not so much out of a sense of the difficulty of the Age and Times under which the All-wise God hath *calculated* and *cast my lot* (wherein (yet) I deem it necessar, (if ever) to joyn the *Serpent* with the *Dove*) as out of a *Consciousness* of *Personal Insufficiency* for such *suistical Debates*: But afterwards upon *mature deliberation*, wherein I trust not *Flesh and Blood*, but the *Spirit* was my *Counsellour* (*safety* vailing to *Duty*; and *Truth* breeding *Confidence*) I judg'd my self oblig'd to give an *Answer* touching the *reason* (as of my *Hope*, so) of my *Practice* in the Case of my *Non-Communion*, &c. And now, that I am (*volens-volens*) become (*Jeremiah-like*) a *Man of Contention*, 'he World will know *what* and (in part) *whom* (originally) to impute it to.

Jerub-baal ('tis presumed) *threw down the* —
— *Altar*, and (now it is by you repaired) th' *Other Throw* is the *Design* of his *Resurrection*; namely this *Second* (and, (for ought I yet know) of this nature, my *last*) *Attempt*, here address'd to your own *Impartial Examination*, by unavoidable *Diversions* hitherto prevented.

There

4 Of *Sinfull*
Practice charged upon my
Non-Communion in *Common-Prayer*: publicly at *Lovence Church-door*.

* *Prove an Answer* provided an *Answer* at the *Ministry*.

:Pet 3. 15.

Jer. 15. 10.

There be *Five Queries*, Sir, upon the Resolution whereof depends the full decision of this Controversie, to one or more of which, whatever is Material or but seemingly Cogent in your *Reply* may be reduced; which I intend *Objection-wise* to propound, and (God assisting) with satisfaction to altoile: In order whereunto, my first work shall be, to enfeeble your (*now pretended*) *Plea*, and to answer to a few previous Cavils and Exceptions.

Mr. *Croftons Plea* is for *Communion with Gods Church*, Page 2, 3. in the *Worship administred by the Liturgy*, (which is but a Political Order, and Direction unto Praying, &c.) and 19, 22, &c. that only in case of Necessity; So that *Communion* in Gods *Worship*, thus ministrred, not *Communion* in this Ministerial, Mode, is Mr. *Croftons Question*. Answ. This Sir, seems to be with you the Cardinal Point, the very Cris and Hinge of the present Controversie, (Page 18) and therefore is become a *Recolta Crambe* in your *Reply*, occurring no lesse then (about) twenty times therein; but would you be pleased a little to deny *Learned-Self* in the Case, perswaded I am, it would appear to your self as well as others, to be but a more plausible *Evasion*. For Sir,

The Question between Mr. *Crofton* and me, is not about Ministerial Communion in Common-Prayer, which is (properly) Communion in or by, the *Liturgy* considered as a Ministerial Mode, (in your words) being the Personal Administration and Official Performance of the Minister, as the Common-Mouth, and in the Name, of his Hearers, in the use thereof; for who knows not that 'we (with thousands more (as I am informed) of Tongue-tied Ministers) are by Law reduced to a Popular Capacity, the Station of Hearers? (Conformists are in this sense, the only Communicants; of which Predicament you and I (through mercy) are None): But about Popular Communion, which is the Joynt-Communion of the People or Hearers, with the Minister, in Common-Prayer, or the *Worship* exhibited by the *Liturgy*; Viz. Whether This Communion be Duty, or no Duty? Mr. *Crofton* disputing for the Affirmative, that it is; I for the Negative, that it is not, Common-Prayer appearing to me.

me to be none of Christs *Real-Solemn-Instituted Worship*; as is largely proved in *Jernb baal*. But belike I am guilty of a *strained Confidence* in affirming that Mr. Crofton saith, *The Liturgy or Common-Prayer is an Act of Solemn Publique Worship*; whereas he saith no such thing. *Ans.* Sir, My *Confidence* was well bottomed, for proof whereof, be perswaded (once more) to revise *Reformation not Separation*, Page 25. where (according to the Connexion and plainest Grammatical construction of the words) 'tis affirmed, that *Common-Prayer*, notwithstanding the *weakness* in the use, *wickedness* in the *Imposition*, and *wisfullness* in the return and retention of the *defective, disorderly set Form*, ceaseth not to be *Publique-Solemn Prayer*; and is that other than *Common-Prayer*? Sir, this is a moer *λογωμαχία*: That the *Liturgy* taken for a *prescribed Form* of *Worship*, and considered *Literally* or *Syllabically* is *Solemn Worship*, or *Worship* at all (properly) none I presume will affirm, (lash me for *Solecismes* if I do) But by *Liturgy* and *Common-Prayer* (which I joyn together as signifying the same thing) I understand the *Worship* ministred by the *Publique Set-Form* commonly called *Divine Service* (according to the most genuine signification and *Etymology* of *ἱεραγία* the *Holy Ghosts* own *Dialect*, which frequently in Scripture denotes * *Publique Ministry*, or *Religious Service* and *Administrations*; as *Zacharias* his *Liturgy*, *Luke* 1. 23. So *St. Pauls Liturgy*, *Phil.* 2. 17.) as may appear from my interpretation of it in the *Minor-Proposition* of that (sighted) *Syllogism*, formed (to as much advantage on your part, as the *Medium* would carry with it, let the learned judge) upon your own *Principle* and *Conclusion Argumentative*: Viz.

1. *Communion with the Church-Visible in Solemn Publique Worship, is an Essential part of the Sanctification of the Sabbath, or Lords Day, and Positive Indispensable Duty.* &c.

But *Communion with the Church of England in her Liturgy and Common-Prayer* (commonly called *Divine Service*) is *Communion with the Church-Visible in Solemn Publique Worship*.

ERGO

Communis-



Communion with the Church of England in her Liturgy and Common-Prayer is an Essential part of the Sanctification of the Sabbath or Lords Day, and Positive Indispensable Duty; which Argument (I dare say) you cannot now (after recollection) term *Monstrum* any more: Certainly, If *Communion in Common-Prayer be Duty*, *Non-Communion* in it must be *Schism* or *Sinfull Separation*, (the Thing in Question); the Contrary of both which hath been abundantly evidenced in *Jerub baal*, or the *Remonstrance*, particularly by the solution of This (which I call Mr. *Croftons*) *Doom-Argument*.

But

The Peoples personal Aiding by Conclamations, Popular Page 18. *Responds, and groundless Variation of Gestures* (which Mr. *Crofton* never advised or justified) is properly *Communion in the Liturgy*. *Ans.* 1. This is *Popular Communion*, which though it be more *Extensive* and therefore (in this respect) more *aggravated* than That of Mr. *Crofton*, yet is not more *Real Communion* than his; the Adhibition of his *Amen* being his *Personal Ait* and *Assent*, and a note of *Suffrage* and *Communion* sufficient in the purest Administrations, 1 Cor. 14. 16. (*Magis et minus non variant speciem*) Now the Question is not about the *Magis* and *Minus*, the *Extent* and *Latitude*, or *Degree* of Communion; but about the Thing which (to me) is *unlawfull*. Again 2. Some of the *Popular Responsories* being made so *Essential* to Prayer, as that all that the Minister saith, (to use the words *Smec. Rediv.* of the *Smellymman Divines*) is no Prayer without them, p. 10. as in the *Litany*; and Mr. *Crofton* professing that he cannot deny his *Amen* to the matter of any of the Petitions, *Ref. not* *Sep. P. 25.* whose enjoined the people not excepted) will he not be found to communicate (even) in those *Responsories* and *Acclamations*, though not *vocally* and *declamatorily*, yet really in the Adhibition of his *Amen* (a *Communicants Suffrage*) and (thus) to justify the confused multitude in their condemned *Bablings* and *Barlogies*? Mar 6. 7: How will you (his *Nuncio*) defend him in this?

The Liturgy is but a Political (though *Ecclesia-* Page 22. *stisk*) *Order and Direction*, &c. *Ans.* 'Tis strange you

you should confound the *Liturgy* and the *Directory* (the *Assembly* and the *Convocation*) turning the *whole* into a *Rubrick*; whereas the One doth only *summarily propose* and *direct* unto, proper *Materials* for Prayer, and due *Method* and *Order* of Administration, commending the *free use* of *Words, Phrases, and Expressions*, (according to *Variety* of *Gift, Intention* or *Utterance*, or the *Impulse* of the *Holy Ghost*) as being *arbitrarily Variable* (*provenata*,) as *Emergent Cases* or *Occasions* shall require; But the Other doth not only *direct Method* and *Order*, but *dictate Words & Expressions* also, severely *confining* (*wind-bound Souls*) thereunto, *ad syllabam usque*, *intercharching* upon the *Dictatorship* of the *Holy Ghost* (that *Bosom-Advocate*) whose *Office* it is to *enlure Prayer*, and to furnish with suitable *Expressions* *External*, as well as with suitable *Affections Internal*, *Rom. 8. 26.* and *1 Cor. 2. 4 & 13.* compared.) as also upon *Scripture-Directory*. In the *Assemblies Directory*, *Method* and *Order* was (only) *proposed*; In (some) other *Reformed Churches*, a *Form of Prayer* (the *use* of it being left *Arbitrary*) is *composed*, but in the *Church of England* a *stinted Liturgy* and *Forms of Prayer*, is with the greatest severity *imposed*: Now shall those be confounded? I had thought *Mr. Crofton* had in his *Position* affixed to the *Reply*, disputed only against a *stinted Liturgy*, but belike it is against a *Directory* too: the *Assembly-Divines* will give him no thanks for that.

Page 3.

Mr. Croftons Plea is for *Communion in the Worship ministr'd by the Liturgy, only in case of Necessity.*

Ans. 1. I confess, *Mr. Croftons Condition* (*Good man!*) being at (first) by reason of his (too well known) * *Prison-restraint* (which I cannot reflect upon without a *passionate sympathy*) *Extraordinary*, his *Practice* was the more *Excusable*, but — I cannot say *justifiable*; for *Sir, 2.* *Presence in the time of Common-Prayer* may be in some cases *necessary*, whereas *Personal Participation or Communion in the Worship* is (*presum'd to be*) *unlawful* (of which more hereafter under the fourth *Querie.*) Thus my *Friend's Bodily Presence* might be in that condition *necessitated*

in the Tower
of London.

rated in the place, but not his Communion, in the *Worship*. But 3. The *Integrals of Worship* are preserved, and *Communion* therein maintained, in, *Concerved Prayer, Praises, Hearing of the Word, read or preached*. So that your alledged *Case of Necessity*, is a frivolous Plea. And 4. Suppose the worst, namely, that the *Liberty of Publick* (both) *Praying and Preaching* were abridged, the one restricted to the *stinted Liturgy*, the other to a *Prescript Form of Homilies*, (and that the *Glory* which is (already) gone to the *Threshold*, should (thus) leave our *Temple and Jerusalem*, *Englands Ichabod*;) thank God more than *Man* that it is not so) then your Plea of *Necessity*, &c. might (seem to) be more feasible; your own *Latitude* and freedom you might use in such a case; but for my part, let me be an *Exile*, rather than a *Communicant* in such *Alphabetary Service* and *Mock Worship*; sooner should I chuse to be a *Private Votary*, than a *Church-Superstitiary*, knowing that the House of an *Obed-Edom* may lodge the *Ark of God*; and what sober person would not in such a case account *stolen waters sweet*, and * *bread eaten in secret*, pleasant. These dismissed I proceed.

That *Personal Corruptions* in *Scandalous Professors* (*Ministers* as well as others) the *Hophnie's* and *Phinehas's* of our Age, *defile a Church*, is an Assertion, which I cannot consent to. *Ans. Personal Corruptions*, Sir, are there contradictory to *Real Corruptions*, not to *Publick*, as it seems you understand it; while you say (Page 20.) *Personal Sin*, and *Church-guilt* are a *Contradiction*, &c. See *Jerub-baal*, Page 18.

Communion (saith he) is twofold, viz:

One by *Profession*; Another by *Participation*; but I under-stand not the *Necessity* and *Priviledges* he appropriates to *Communion by Profession*, if *That Profession* be abstracted from, and opposed to *Participation*; *Ans.* That this *Distinction* is needfull and pertinent to the case in hand, is apparent from hence, namely, That the *Profession* and *Owning* of the *true Religion*, the *Faith*, *Dollrine*, and *Instituted Worship* of

B

Christ,

* *bread of Secret*
sies, Pro. 9. 17.
Page 19.

Christ, is *ad semper* indispensably Necessary; whereas *Personal Participation* of, (or *Joynt-Communion* in) the *Ordinances*, is not alwayes Possible; as is evident from the *Persons* and *Cases* mentioned in *Jerub-baal*, Page 20, whither I refer the Reader.

Page 20, 21. Mr. Croston will deny that there are many, or indeed any *Members of the Universal Church* who never had opportunity of associating themselves with, or of *Joynt-Communion* in the *Solemn Worship of God* (you should have added) in a *Particular Church*; *Ans.* 1. By the *Universal Church* is meant the *Catholique Militant Church*, comprehending both the *Visible* and *Invisible*, which sense squareth well with my Discourse, the inconsistency is not shewed. 2. That one may be a *Member of the Church Catholique-Invisible* (a *Believer*) who (yet) never had opportunity of *Joynt-Communion* in a *Particular Church*, as a *Fellow-Worshipper* therein; you seem to imply while you restrict my sense of the *Universal*, to the *Visible Church*; (which certainly is not impossible, though not usual); Now that *Believer* may be (also) a *Professor*; and therefore a *Member of the Church Catholique-Visible*, viz: as a *Professor* (*Personal Profession* being the ground of *Visible-Church-Membership*) as well as a *Member of the Church Catholique-Invisible*, as a *Believer*, (the *Professor* is *Visible*, the *Believer Invisible*;) a *Professor of the same Faith* with the *Visible Members of the Catholique*, though not a *Partaker of the same Ordinances* with the *Associated Members of a Particular Church*; is confessed by greater *Sophies* than I am ever like to make, contrary to your Assertion, Page 21.*

* See Mr. Camdrey his Treatise called, *Independence of a great Schism*. chap. 7. page 127.

Page 22. Mr. Croston doth deny that 10, 20, 30, or 40 *Private Particular Members* (among whom may be a *Minister by his Office*, a *Publique Officer*) assembled in a place distinct from the *Publique Assembly*, is a *Church* or *holy Convocation*, else he must be at a loss how to know a *Conventicle*, or determine a *Schismatical Assembly*. *Ans.* A *Society of Persons* consisting of ten, twenty, thirty, or forty *Private Particular Members*, amongst whom there is, by *Calling and Office* a *Minister*, wheresoever convened, in order to the *Celebration*

tion and Performance of true Divine Worship, according to the Will of Christ, through the Assistance of the Spirit of Christ, in the Name of Christ; is no *Conventicle*, or *Schismatical Assembly*, whilst they do not causelessly and unjustly separate from (those which we call) *Church-Assemblies*, but a *True Church*, an *Holy Convocation*, and a *Lawfull Assembly*, else beleeve it, you will be at a greater losse how to sense that great Protest, Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them, Mat. 18. 20. where the Solemn Promise of Christs Presence is made to Two or Three (a *Quorum of Fellow-Worshippers*) * See Jerub. wheresoever convened in Christs Name; * Gospel-Liber-ty including Local-Liberty in point of Divine Worship. 25, 26, 27, 28. These premised the *Questions* follow.

Quest. I. What is that which may warrant and acquit from Schism, a Persons Non-Communion with the Church of England, in the Worship (alleged to be) ministred by her Liturgy, or Common-Prayer?

Ans. This Question thus fully and clearly stated, I shall endeavour to resolve in these ensuing Propositions; to which I shall (respectively) affix the *Objections* proper to each, and assoile them.

Prop. 1. Communion with This Part of the Church *Prop. 1.* *Catholicus-Visibile*, the Church of England, in that Worship whereof God is for. (*Matter and Manner*) the *Author* as well as the *Object*; the *Word*, the *Rule*, as well as the *Matter*; the *Catholicus Doctrine* of Christ, (the Churches *Publicque Head* and *Law-giver*), the *Apostles*, his *Emissaries* (the Churches *Publicque Guides* and *Officers*); the *Gospel*, his *Testamentary Will*, (the Churches *Publicque Canon* and *Directory*) the *Primitive Christian Church*, during the first two hundred years, (This and all other succeeding Churches *Publick Pattern* and *Ensamble*) being the only *Real-Solemn Divine Worship* in *Gospel-times*, is an *Essential Part* of the *Sanctification* of the *Lords Day*, and the *Positive Indispensable Duty* of every particular Soul called by the name of God in this Kingdom, to be upon peril superseded, or intermitted, upon no less *Warrant* or *Authority*

then *That* which enjoyns it, viz. only in case of some *Real-inevitable Necessity* or *Obstruction*, whether *Providential* (*Opportunity* not serving) or *Physical*, (*Violence* hindering) or *Moral*, (*Corruptions* barring) in which cases we may be confidently assured that *God will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*; In conformity to which principle 'tis my known Practice to joyn with the present *Publick Church-Assemblies*, in *Conceived Prayer, Praises*, and *hearing of the Word*, which are *Christs Real Instituted Worship*, and *Ordinances*.

178. 24.

*Object. Reading of the Word is a publick Ordinance of God, and part of publick solemn Worship. Answ. 1. Who ever denied that Sir? Hearing of the Word, I profess myself a Communicant in; and that when read as well as when preached. 2. Reading of the Word is an Ordinance of God, but the Quantum is not determined; the Species is commanded, but the Parcel is not directed: the Thing is appointed, but the Degree or Measure is not calculated; thus the Reading of Scripture is Divine Worship, but hanc vel illam sacri textus partem legere, to read this or that part or parcel of it (saith * Zanchius) is not; now Sir, the Ordinance is maintained in Publick, (and my Communion therein) in the Textual Readings and Occasional Quotations of Scripture.*

* In Urbin par.
3. quest. 95.
p. 8. 693.

Prop. 2.

Prop. 2. Common-Prayer or the Worship administred or administtable, by the English Liturgy or Publick Set-Form, considered (in sensu composito, in individuo, connexive, et quæ talis) as such, and, in a complex state, appears (as yet) to be, none of That Worship, whereof, Christ is the Author; the Gospel, the Rule; the Practice Apostolique the Pattern; but Cultus Adulterinus, meer Adulterate Worship, a Piece of Superstition, Arbitrary Devotion, Scripture-bitten Will-Worship, Super-erogatory Service, a Law-Col. 2. 22, 23. struck Tradition, and Ordinance of Man. But,

pag. 8, 9, 10,
17, 26, 27,
29, 31.

Object. 1. There is in Common-Prayer the Substance of Divine Worship (though disorderly ministred) the Essential Form of Prayer, which consists in calling upon God in the Name of Christ, for things agreeable to his Will; so that the Object of this Worship is God in Christ, the Matter

of

of it *Things appointed by the Lord himself*, the *Form* of it, *In the Name of Christ* : VVhat ? and yet *Superstition* and *Will-Worship* ! *Ans.* VVhether the *Matter* of the *Petitions* be good or no; I shall not now enquire ; but this supposed, I Reply,

1. The *Essential Form* of *Prayer*, must be determined upon, by its *General Nature*, viz. as *Prayer* is *Instituted Worship*, as well as by its *Specific Difference*, viz. as it is *Such a Species* or *Part* of *Worship* : Now then, That there is in *Common-Prayer* (considered as above) the *Essential Form* of *Prayer*, is disputable. But doth not the *Essential Form* of *Prayer* consist in *Calling upon God in the Name of Christ* ? *Ans.* Did Mr. *Crofton* include the *Name* of *Christ*, the *Will* or *Authority* of *Christ*, in which *Glosse* he hath with disdain disowned, (*Pag.* 27.) I could not reject his *Description* as *Defective* and *Inadequate* to the *Nature* of *Prayer*, whose *Substance* and *Essentials* consist in *Calling upon God* in a *Manner*, as well as for *Matters Instituted*, and agreeable to his *Will*, in the *Name* and *Mediation* of *Jesus Christ* ; where *Prayer* is considered, 1. *In Genere*, as *Instituted Worship*, or *Religious Service*, performable to *God*, in *Obedience* and *Conformity*, both for *Matter*, and *Manner*, or *Form*, to his *Revealed Will*, (the *Rule* of every *Duty Moral*), which is the *Genus*, *Common* to *Prayer*, *Preaching*, and all other *Parts* of *Instituted Worship*. 2. *In Specie* as *Such a Part* of *Worship*, *Calling upon God* in the *Name* (that is, for the *Sake* and *Merits*) of *Christ*, being its *specific difference* ; Both concurring (*Dare Esse*) to constitute the *Essential Form* of *Prayer*. But you mutter,

The *Will* of *Christ* requires *gravity* of *Expression*, *reverence* in *Demeanour*, &c. which come not into the definition of *Prayer* as *essential* to its *Form* ; so it would seem (you would say) that if the *Essential Form* of *Prayer* depend upon *Conformity* to the *Will* of *Christ*, that no *Prayer* is *Essentially* such, but what hath those *Qualifications*. *Ans.* Sir, Two distinct *Commandments* are here confounded, viz. the *second* and *third* ; and

Ans. 1. *Questio*, *Quid sit de quolibet individuo contentus sub specie, non petit Quidditatem ejus singularem sed communem totius speciei.* P. Fonseca in *Metaph. Arist.* lib. 7. cap. 15.

Pag. 27.

and two distinct things, viz. the *Modi* and *Media*, the *Means*, *Outward Manner* and *Form* of VVorship, with the *Modes* and *Adjunct Qualities* of VVorship; the former whereof are directed in the *second*, the latter in the *third* Commandement, and that through the different sense and acceptions of the *Will* of Christ. So that your Reply is insignificant: But for a clear issue of the Case, please to consider (what is Orthodoxy to me, viz.)

All True (Immediate) VVorship of God, is determined in the First Table of the *Moral Law*: The *Object* is more especially directed to, in the first Commandment; the *Means*, *Materials*, *Outward Manner* and *Form* in the *second*; the *Necessary Modification* of it, in the *third*; the *Time* or more *special* and *solemn Season* (which comes not here to be considered) in the *fourth*: God, is proposed, as our *Maker* in the first; His *Will* as Our *Law-maker* in the *second*; His *Attributes*, *Promises*, *Providences*, &c. (the *Great Letters* of his *Name*) in the *third*: *Natural VVorship* (as a *Tributary Homage*) with its *Necessary Qualifications*, *Internal*, is enforced in the first; *Instituted VVorship*, being due from the *Man*, as the Other is from the *Creature*, (our *Reasonable Service*, Rom. 12. 1.) in the *second*; the *Right* and most *fruitful Improvement* of both with due *Modifications* towards the proper *End*, the *Glory* of God, in the *third*. Again, *Prayer* may be considered, either 1. As *Natural VVorship*; or 2. As *Instituted VVorship*; or 3. As *VVorship Modified* with *Gravity* of *Expression*, *Reverence* in *Demeanor*, &c. thus, 1. *Calling upon God* is *Natural VVorship*, and, as such, peculiar to the first Commandment: 2. *Calling upon God*, *Modis et Adminiculis*, in or by, a *Form & Manner*, as well as for *Matter*, dictated and directed in his *Word*, is *Instituted VVorship*, and, as such, peculiar to the second Commandment. 3. *Calling upon God* with the *Modifications*, and *Adjunct Qualities*, mentioned, viz. *Gravity* of *Expression*, *Reverence* in *Demeanor*, &c. is *Natural-Instituted VVorship*, improved and modified, according to the *Third Commandment*. Hitherto also (I humbly conceive) may be most properly referred, The *Calling upon God* in the *Name*, (i.e. for

for the *Sake and Merits* of Christ the *Duty* required therein ; being mainly the *Reverend Esteem* and *Sanctification* of Gods *Name*, Parts whereof are both, *Promises*, which are *Yea* and *Amen* in Christ, and *Attributes*, ^{2 Cor. 1. 20.} which are displayed in the *Promises*, especially those *Titles* of *Grace*, Two *Capital Letters*, in his *Name*, *Mercy* ^{Exod 34. 6.} and *Faithfulness*, *Mercy* being expressed in *making*, *Faithfulness* in *keeping* of them : Christ is glorified by the *Plea*, (For Christs sake, &c.) the *Promises* are verified in Christ ; the *Attributes* are magnified in the *Promises* ; Gods *Name* is sanctified in all. Now to apply.

That *Prayer* which is not agreeable, for *Means*, *Manner* and *Form* to the *Second Commandment* (Gods *Eternal Canon-Law* and *Directory* for *Instituted Worship*) as well as for *Necessary Modes* or *Qualifications* (as *Gravity* of *Expression*, *Reverence* in *Demeanour*, &c.) to the *Third*, may justly be denied to have the *Compleat Essential Form* of *Instituted Worship* ; and such is *Common-Prayer*, or the *Worship* exhibited by your *Novum Organum*, and *Adulterate Ritual*, your *Man-devised Liturgy*, considered (in *sensu composito*) as aforesaid ; being Faulty, *Ex parte Medii*, (therefore contrary to the *Second Commandment*) which you your self upon the matter confesse, when you say the *Ministerial Mode* (i. e. The *fixed Liturgy*, which (yet) is a *Popular Mean* of *Worship*) is defective and disorderly, (throughout your Book) yea, a *Formal Positive Evil*, (Page 39.) Now then Sir, Say *Bona fide* ; Can that *Worship* be said to have the *Compleat Essentials* of true *Divine*, or *Instituted Worship*, which is not warranted by the *Second Commandment* ? And can that *Worship* be said to be warranted by the *Second Commandment* (wherein (say the Learned (as you well know) are directed, *Moda et Adminicula cultus*) whole *Mean*, *Manner*, *Forms* and *Instrument* of *Administration* is a *sinfull positive evil* ? And lastly, Is not the *Liturgy* such *ex se*, by your own *Concession* ? I beseech you Sir, recollect your self ; If the *Medium* be *Adulterate* (as That in question is in *totum*) the *Worship* thereby ministred must needs be so too.

Again

Page 26,
27, &c.

Page 31.

* Modul. The-
ol. lib. 2. c. 13.
n. 26,

Rom. 1. 21.

Again Sir, 2. What other *Definition of Prayer* do you produce, as that whereby you think to prove, that the *Worship* ministered by the *Liturgy* doth exist for *Matter*, and *Essential Form* (or *Substance*) *Gods own*, then what may very well suit with a *Prayer* put up to God before an *Image* (yea and that *intentionally* plac'd before the *Suppliant* too)? May not such a *Prayer* be a *Calling upon God* (the true *Object*) for *Things agreeable to his Will* (*Lawfull Matter*) in the *Name* (i. e. for the *Sake*) of *Jesus Christ*, which is to you the *Essential Form of Prayer*? Ah Sir! Can you afford no better *Pleas* for your *Divine Service*, (and if you cannot, I despair ever to see any) but what may be espoused for defence of *Imagery*? and justify the one as well as the other? Well Sir! you do but display the *Symmetry* (to speak modestly) that is between them. Your next *Plea* then vanisheth, which you thunder out with a bundle of hot *Interrogatories* (by way of *Reply* to my third *Answer* about the *High Places*): *How?* (say you) *Our Worship* *superstitious*? *Our Worship bad*? *Is not God in Christ the Object of it?* *Is not the Matter of it* (I would you could say *Manner* too) *appointed of the Lord?* *Is not the Form of it a Calling upon God in the Name of Christ?* For 1. In *superstitione Deus semper est Objectum et finis aliquo modo*, God is always the *Object*, yea in some respect the *End* (even) of *Superstitious Worship*, saith the *Learned* * *Dr. Ames*, and yet (saith my *Author*) the *Worship* it self is *unlawfull*: Nay further, God is the *Object* to whom *terminativè* and *ultimately* (at least) the *Worship* is directed, which is *relativè* by the intervention of *Images* exhibited; this a *Romish* *Popeling* will tell you: Further yet, The purblind *Gentiles* are taxed as faulty onely in *not glorifying of God AS God*; *Natures Light* directing to the *Object*, though not to the *Right Manner of Worship*; about the latter of which we dispute: But *God in Christ* (*Complexivè*) is the *Object* of your *Worship*: That *God in Christ* is the *Object*, *ex parte colentis*, *intentionally* proposed by you in your *Worship*, God forbid that I should so much as once question, but remember what hath been just now said of *Prayer*

Prayer put up to God before an *Image*. Again 2. What do you think Sir of the *Corinthian Prayers* put up in an *unknown tongue*? Was not *God in Christ* the *Object* of them? Were not *Things* appointed of God, the *Matter* of them? were they not put up in the *Name of Christ*, which (you say *dat Esse*) constitutes the *Essential Form* of Prayer? Can you deny any of those *Queries* retorted upon your self? This *Worship* (one would think) was for *substance*, (*Matter* and *Essential Form* (according to your *Creed*) *Gods own*, and yet condemned by the great *Apostle*, as *Unwarrantable*, 1 Cor. 14. though *Real* yet not *Regular*, *Instituted* *Worship*: But (will you say) *their unknown tongue* and *Expressions*, the *Vehiculum cultus*, was contrary to the *Rules of Edification*, 1 Cor. 14. 12. 26. *Ans.* 'Twas so, as may appear from vers. 17. of that Chapter; and is not the *Liturgy* (which you term *Vehiculum* the *Instrument of Conveyance*, *Ministerial Mode* frequently) contrary to the *Rules of Edification* too? Yes Sir, 'Tis by your own *Confession*, Page 24. 'Tis *un-edifying* and therefore *unwarrantable*; you may please to revivie *Jerub-baal*, Page 32, 33, 34. This is acknowledged, and for your confirmation herein, read over your *Topics of Experience*, &c. I shall need to say no more of a thing wherein we are (happily) agreed; and so I dismiss this Answer.

Ans. 2. *Worship* may be for *Matter & Substance* (in your sense) good and yet *Superstitious*. In four or five respects (to mention no more) may *Worship* merit the name of, or degenerate into *Superstition* and *Wilt-Worship*; viz. 1. In respect of the *Object*, when that *Worship* is yielded the *Creature* which is due to *God*; *Idolatry* forbidden in the first Commandement. 2. In respect of *Matter*; viz. either 1. When the *Matter* of the *Worship* is *sinfull* because forbidden, as, *Prayer* put up for *sinfull* Things, the *Antiquated Jewish Ceremonies*, as *Altar*, *Organ*, *Vestments*, *Festivals*, &c. when referred to *Worship* in *Gospel-times*, &c. or 2. When That which is *Matter of Indifferency* in it self, is observed as *Matter of Worship*, as the *Pharisaical cleansing of Pots and Cups*, (Mark 7. 8.) *Popish Celibacy*, &c.

* *Quin. 2. 2da.*
Quest. 92.
Art. 2.

C

Kntling

Superstition of
god, supra sta-
tutum &c.

* Pacificus
Examination,
&c. It seems
(saith he) to
be mere Will-
worship and
Tradition,
condemned
Mat. 15. 9. Isa.
1. 12, 13. Col. 2.
20, 22, 23. Pag.
20.

† Ibid. page. 7.

Kneeling at the Supper, &c. In respect of Measure or Degree, as the *Pharisees* nice observance of the *Sabbath-Day*, and *Supererogatory Cessation* thereupon. 4. In respect of Means or Manner, as the *Imagery* forbidden in the second Commandment; the Exhibition of Worship to God in a Manner or Form, not directed in his *Statute-Law*, or *Revealed Will*, &c. 5. In respect of *Tautologies*, or *Battologies*, and *Vain Repetitions*, expressly prohibited by Christ Himself, Mat. 6. Now though we should acquit the *Worship* in Question, from the brand of *Superstition* and *Will-Worship* in the two first respects, yet what can it be other in the two last? What other is the frequent Repetition of the *Doxology*, *Gloria Patri*, &c? as is confessed by Learned Mr. * *Prynne*: What other is the often Rehearsal of the *Lords Prayer* (condemned by the same † Author)? And O how sad is it when what was on purpose Instituted to prevent *Superstition*, is turned into *Superstition*? The Antidote into the Disease! Instituted *Worship* into *Will-Worship*!) What other are the *Popular Responses*, *Good Lord deliver us*; *We beseech thee to hear us good Lord*? And That, *Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this Law*? The *Rabble-Epiphonema's*, the former, to most of the *Petitions* in the *Letany*, the latter to all the *Commandments* save one: What other is that *spurious Brai* of *Chiming Devotion*, by *Antiphony* & *Responsal*, a *Rabble-Dialogue*, *Alternate Interlocutions*, *Vicissitudinary Babbling*, and confused *Acclamations* between *Priest* and *People*? For which can be alledged no *Precept* nor *Precedent* in *Scripture*, or *Solid Antiquity*, but onely in *Papish Missals*, *Pontificals*, *Offices*, *Processionals*, *Ceremonials*, &c. as is acknowledged by the abovenamed Author; (*ibid.*) What is all this, (and a great deal more of such stuff) other than the *Pharisaical Leaven* of *Superstition*? unless that be *Penal* in our *Modern* & *Junior Pharisees*, which was *Culpable* in their *Seniors*; as if *Proceffe* of *Time* could expiate *Iniquity*. But Sir, 2. *Common-Prayer* or *Liturgie-Worship* is *Superstition* and *Will-Worship*, *Ex parte mediæ*, the *Liturgie* or *Instrument* of *Conveyance*, whereby this *Worship* (you say)

say) is exhibited, being a meer *Man-devised Frame*, yea by your own Confession, (Page 39.) a *Formal Positive Evil*: But what say the Learned? consult them in the case: See *Aquinas* (2. 2da, Quest. 92. Art. 1. et 2.) See *Ambrose* (In Ep. ad Cololl. cap. 2.) See *Zanchy* (de vitiiis Ext. Cult. oppos. lib. 1. de Superstit. Thef. 1.) *Parent* (in *Ursin*, Part. 3. Quest. 96.) *Calvin* (Instit. lib. 4. cap. 10. sect. 24.) *Ames* (Medul. Theol. lib. 2. cap. 13. N. 23. 25.) *Bp Davenant* (In Ep. ad Col. cap. 2.) *Bp Andrews* with *Dod* and *Byfield* (on the 2d Commandment) a *Cloud of Witnesses* (many more might I name) from whose Testimony and Description of *Superstition* and *Will-Worship*, 'tis evident that the *Worship* exhibited by your blasted *Ritual*, (considered as above) can be no other, and therefore no Part of Christ's *Instituted Worship*, being *Ex parte Modi vel Medii*, contrary to the *Modus Prescriptus* (to use *Bp Andrews* his words) Gods own *Man-ner of Worship* prescribed in the second Commandment. These things thoroughly weighed, I doubt not *Sir* but you will perceive that you do *Onuphrius*-like, advocate (but) in a very bad cause.

* Cultui huius
Instituti oppo-
nitur ut illicitus
voluntarius
ille Cultus
qui ab homini-
bus excogita-
tur. Ames.
lococitato.

Object. 2. But what reason is rendred why God is not worshipped by the Liturgy? It is this, The Manner and Form is humane (for the Matter is yielded and the Essential Form of the Worship he cannot deny) and so is the Mode and Form of a studied Sermon, and conceived Prayer: and is not God worshipped by them? Ans. 1. That Worship is said to be *Humane*, which is of *Man*, considered not as an *Agent*, so much as an *Author* or petty *Law-giver*, being exhibited, *Humana Voluntate et Electione*, (to use Learned *Davenant* his words) meerly at his own Choice, without *Authentique Precept or Precedent*, as if the *Means* or *Manner of Divine Worship* were arbitrarily Eligible by *Man*; and hence such Worship is called *Will-Worship*: Thus 2. The *Manner and Form* of the *Worship* in question is (by me) justly called *Humane*; not because it is exhibited by *Man*, *Instrumentally*, (as all *Worship* is) but because it proceeds from *Man*, *Originally*, and not from any *Authority*

Page 26.

* In Epist. ad
Colof. cap. 2.
v. 23.

thority bottomed upon *Scriptura-Precept*, or *Precedent*; the *Will* and *Wisdom* of *Man* therein, encroaching upon *Christ's Crown-Prerogative* and *Supremacy*, (whose *Right* it is, as the *Fathers Plenipotentiary* to prescribe and institute the *Means, Manner* and *Form*, all the *Ingredients* and *Appendants* of his *own Worship*; as the *Man Moses* did all the *Tabernacle-Appurtenances*, even to a *Pin* and *Snuffers*.) *Man's Wisdom* being exalted in opposition to *God's Wisdom*, in the *Composition*; *Man's Will* to *God's Will* in the *Imposition*, of such a *Form, Frame*, and *Complexion* of *Worship*; (contrary to the *second Commandment*, which determines the *Means, Manner*, and *Form*, and *Necessary Helps*, the true Nature of all *Instituted Worship*): inasmuch,

* *Instr. lib. 4. cap. 10. sect.*

24.

Complaint upon this very account of *Superstition* and *Will-Worship*. Whereupon 3. That there is the *Essential Form* of *Worship* (sensed according to your notion) in *Common-Prayer*, is justly denied, and (I presume) as clearly disproved above; what ground then for your too confident put-off—*The Essential Form of Prayer he cannot deny?* No? I believe you will henceforth call in your confidence; and both you and others will know upon what account 'twas said, *God is not worshipped by the Liturgy*. Now 4. The *Form* of a studied *Sermon* and conceived *Prayer* cannot be said to be *Humane* in the sense aforesaid; for though it be both in the one, and in the other an *All of Humane Judgement* and *Invention*, yet it is in both an *All of Obedience*; though *Man* be an *Actor* in both, yet he is the (Prime) *Author* of neither; *Christ* is the great *Law-giver* in subjection and conformity to whose *Will* or *Law*, the *Form* (*Edifying Expressions*, due *Method* and *Order*, &c.) in both is by *Man* as a *Subject*, *Servant*, *Instrument*, and *subordinate Agent* contrived, acted, and practis'd by: *Preaching* of the *Word* and *Prayer* are *Institutions* of *Christ*; *Preaching* and *Praying* in an *Edifying Manner* and *Method*, is an *Institution* of *Christ* too, falling under the necessary *Laws* of *Edification* and *Order*, 1 Cor. 14. 12. 26. 40. In which respect (I fear not to assert) the *Ministerial Mode* of

Of *Worship* is determined by the Lord in his Word : But *Preaching*, after this or that method, whether *Exegetically* by *Analytical Explication*, or more *Practically*, by *Doctrine, Reason and Use*, &c. is left to the *Wisdom, Faithfulness*, and *prudential determination* of the *Preacher* ; but so, as that it is directed in *specie*, under the *general Rules* of *Edification and Order*, mentioned ; yea and may be dictated in *Individuo*, though not by a *special* or *saving*, yet by a *Ministerial* and *Common Impulse* of the *Spirit* ; in which respect the *Form* or *Method* is an *Act of Obedience* ; and therefore no Argument of *Will-Worship*. Again, though *praying* variably alter this or that *Method*, by *such*, or *such Words*, or *Expressions*, as may seem to be most pertinent, pithy, and edifying, — be a Matter of *Indifference*, yet it is not *Humane* (or taxable with *Will-Worship*) in the sense aforesaid, being 1. *Enjoyed in specie*, by *Christ* as *Legislator*, 1 Cor. 14. 12. 26. 40. And 2. *Endited, in Individuo*, by the *Spirit* as *Dictator*, Rom. 8. 26. 1 Cor. 2. 4. 13. &c. 14. 16 being *The words which the Holy Ghost teacheth* ; the *free Gales* of the *Spirit*, the *Arbitrary blowings* of that wind, (John 3. 8.), the *fruit* of a *Divine Principle*, the *Spirit of God* (either as to the *Common Gift*, or *Special Grace*, or both-) an *Act of Obedience* to a *Divine Law* ; the *Word of God* ; and (* therefore) a *Mean* conducing to a *Divine End*, the *Glory of God* ; neither of which can be attributed to the *Liturgy* (nor indeed (for ought I can yet see) to any such *Form*,) but seems to be peculiar to *Conceived Prayer* ; not the first, by your own *Concession*, Page 24. where it is yielded me, and *Confession*, Page 39. where you term it a *Positive Evil* ; therefore sure not *enjoyed*, no, not in *genere* ; I would our *Church-Pilots* would produce so much as one *Example* for it, either in *Christ*, or his *Apostles*, or the *Primitive-Christian Church*, (which I despair ever to see), and the case is decided: Not the second, for the *Liturgy* taken for the *Form* is condemned among^t the words which *Mans Wisdom* teacheth, 1 Cor. 2. 13. which are there opposed to the words which the *Holy Ghost* teacheth ; so that the *Matter* thereby exhibited, is also *predicated*, *hinted*,

* Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 9. in Math.

limited, limited, to the highest encroachment (at once) upon the Son, the Spirit, the Attributes, the Will and Wisdom of God: Oh horrid presumption! what other Author hath it then Man? what other Law then Lust? what other End then Self? Oh horrid presumption! Again, the Liturgy is to you a Positive Evil (Page 39.) Then surely you cannot, dare not, (nor no man else) father it upon the Holy Ghost; this were to make God the Author of Sin; then which what more treasonable blasphemy? abse!

Page 25,
26.

Object. 3. *If God be not worshipped by the Modes and Forms directed in the Liturgy, then it followeth, that our first Reformers and Marian Martyrs, rejoiced in, and dyed under a Mode of Worship, by which God could not be worshipped; and a great many more such Absurdities. Ans. To this Argument ab absurdo, I reply briefly; 1. Though the Practice of our first Reformers (those Antisites Ecclesie) Marian Worthies - of whom the world was not worthy, and others mentioned, (whose praise is throughout the Churches) is no contemptible Plea (I must needs say) in the case; yet considering that a Peter may Judaize, and that the Truth is to be measured by the Rule, and not by the Practice of Fallible Men, and that the Rule seems not to warrant, but severely to condemn all such Means, Manner, Method, and Modes of Worship, as That in question is, I am obliged to conclude, that the alledged Practice, &c. was but the dark-side of those Pillars, and therefore no Authentique Pattern or Precedent to any succeeding Ages or Persons. Again 2. That the Persons named, did rejoice in such a Form of Worship, is justly questioned, and that any dyed for it (as if Life and Liturgy were the only Competitors in their Cause) is as freely denied, I should much derogate from their Martyr-Glory in calculating the cause of their Martyrdoms to that which was a very Spot in their Feasts; which (I am apt to think) cost some of them tears, is it like then that it cost any of them blood, (their life)? 3. There is a great disparity between their Case and Ours, for (not to mention the different Ages of the Church, which should be like to an Encreasing Moon) the Superstition*

tion to which the *Liturgy* hath been notoriously abused; the *Scandal* which will unavoidably follow both from the *Ministerial use* of it, and *Popular Communion* by it; the Intervening *Obligations* binding against both, render it *Sinfull* to us, though it were graunted to have been *Lawfull* to them. And 4. *Ad hominem* If the *Liturgy* be *unlawful*, a *Formal Positive Evil*, such as a *Minister* cannot lawfully use or *Officiate* by (as you professe it is (Page. 26. 27. 39. and in the *Position*, &c.) then it followeth that our first *Reformadoes*, our *Marian-Martyrs*, and all our pious, painfull Preachers, in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, and most of the Reigne of King *Charles* the First, did; and all the *Ministers* who now minister in publicque, do, use, officiate and administer by a *sinfull*, and *unlawfull Form* of Worship, a *Formal Positive Evil*! Sir, weigh the matter impartially, then say what greater absurdity can be charged upon the practice of the Persons named from my principle, than may from your own, what greater breach of *Charity* mine infers, than doth your own; I say God is not worshipped by the *Liturgy*, and you say (in effect) God is dishonoured by the *Liturgy*; as he must needs be, if it be a *sinfull Form*, a *Formal Positive Evil*, (your own *Dialect*,) this by way of Retortion. But to conclude. 5. The Devotion of the Persons named, was not, (is not) confined to the *Liturgy*; thus Sir, though God was not worshipped by it, yet He was, and is worshipped by, *Conceived Prayer*, *Praises*, the *Word* Read and Preached, &c. his own *Instituted Worship* and *Ordinances*, &c. Charge me not then with *Sekarian uncharitableness*.

Prop. 3. Though a *Set Form* of Prayer or *stinted Liturgy* *Prop. 3.* were (granted to be) *in genere*, *visum* (as *Basil*) or *ut in unum visum*, (as *Nazianzen*) a Matter of *Indifference* in it self, as a thing neither commanded nor forbidden in the *Eternal Word* of God; yet *This* of the Church of *England* (as the Case is *hic & nunc*) is no matter of *Indifference*: Though the Exhibition of *Worship* to God, by *This Form*, were *lawful quoad substantiam operis*, (in the words of *Parvus*) as to the *Substance* of the Work; yet

In Rom. 14. dub. 1.

it

it is *unlawful, ratione Effetti*, (I shall english it) in three palpable respects, (to name no more) *viz.* In regard of 1. The *Scandal* accruing from it; 2. The *Superstition* (not to say *Idolatry*) that it hath been notoriously abused to; and 3. The (once) sacred and solemn *Expulsion* of it; in which Cases, what is Matter of *Indifference* in itself, becomes Matter of *Iniquity* to us.

* Cent. l. 2. As touching *Scandal*, witness the, * *Magdeburgian* Cen-
c. 4. col. 441. turators, † *St. Augustine*, * *Zanchini*, † *Pareus*, * *Chem-*
† Ep. 35. ad nitius, all cited in the Case, in the Learned *Dispute* against
Casul. the *English-Popish Ceremonies*; to which I add † *Cardinal*
* *De Imag.* *Cajetan*, who saith, that in case of *Scandal* we ought to ab-
p. 39. stain a *spiritualibus non necessariis*, from *Non-Necessaries*
† In Rom. 14. (a modest denomination of the Thing in Question) even
dub. 1. in *Spirituals*: Need I to add any more? Consult *St. Paul's*
* *Enchiridion*.
p. 179. *Topicks* of *Scandal*; What saith the Holy Ghost? 1 *Cor.*
† See Com. in 8. 8, 9. 'Tis sad if neither *Humane* nor *Divine* Testimony
2. 2da. Quæst. will convince in a case of such Consequence: But of this
43. Art. 7. more hereafter.

As touching *Superstition*, 'Tis for ought I perceive generally agreed upon amongst the Learned. 'Twas a pithy

* Lib. 7. 'com- Observation of famous Bishop * *Hall* (a strenuous Patron
temp. of the of *Common-Prayer*) upon *Hezekiah's breaking* of the *Bra-*
Brazen Ser- zen Serpent — *Superstitious usage* can mar the very *In-*
pent. stitutions of God, how much more the most wise and well-

grounded *Devices* of *Men*? True! Reverend *Hall*,
the *IDOL-Liturgy* not excepted. If *Hezekiah* be
commended for that he brake down the *Brazen Serpent*
(though instituted by God himself) when by the *Israelites*
abused to his dishonour, how much more praise-worthy

* Com. in Eph. 5. (saith * *Zanchini*) are our Reformers, for abolishing
of Rites instituted by *Men* (like our selves) being found
full of *superstitious abuse*, though in themselves, they had
not been evil? Now who cannot witness the *superstitious*
abuse of *Englands Liturgy*? *Superstitious* say I? nay *Ido-*

* *Smell. Re-* latious? VVhat was by the * *Smellynnuan Episcopo-Ma-*
div. p. 10. *ssex* alleadged of the *Liturgy* 20. years agoe, I doubt
is verified of it still, — 'Tis so much *Idolized*, as that it is

account-

accounted the onely worship of God in England, (the Monopoly of Divine Service, *Jerub-baal*, Page 29.) and cryed up as if the Wis of Men and Angels could not mend it: it is, — May the Lord put it into the hearts of King and Parliament (upon second thoughts) *Jerub-baal*-like, to give it the same entertainment (and no better) that *Jacob* gave the *Idol-Ear-rings*; *Moses*, the *Golden-Calf*; *Joshua*, the *Temple of Canaan*; *Gideon* and *Elijah*, *Baals-Altar*; *Jehu*, his *Vestments*; *Josiah*, his *House*; *Heczekiah*, the *Brazen Serpent*; else — 'tis to be feared, It may prove a *stinging Serpent* to these Nations.

As touching the Sacred and Solemn Expulsion of this blasted *Nehushtan*, I referre the Courteous Reader to *Jerub-baal*, Page 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54. concluding this with the saying of Judicious Mr. * *Calvine* concerning * *Epist. or*
the Ceremonies of the Interim (applicable to our case) *Resp. Col.*
“Granting (saith he) That the Ceremonies of the Interim 119.
“were things in themselves Indifferent, yet the restitution
“of them in those Churches which were once purged from
“them, is no Indifferent Thing; So granting that the Li-
“turgy in question, were in it self an Indifferent Thing, yet
the restitution of it in a Church once (sacredly-solemnly)
purged from it, is no Indifferent Thing; See *Quest. 5.*

Object. *Mr. Crofton* is sensible that Men, & good Men Page 39.
are and will be scandalized by his Communion in the Worship
ministred by this Mode; but this is by Accident, not from
the nature of his Act, but from the Ignorance and weaknesse
of those that take it, and therefore are no bar to his duty.
Ans. 1. Do you thus plead for *Mr. Crofton*? Is he indeede
sensible, and doth he foresee that Men, Good Men will be,
(yea) are scandalized by his Communion, &c. And will he
go on? Is he no more compassionate towards the tender of
the Flock, poor *Scrupulous Weaklings*? His alledged fore-
knowledge must needs accent and aggravate his Crime. Will
he wilfully—destroy those by his meat for whom *Christ* dyed? *Rom. 14. 15.*
God forbid! But 2. Hath the Liturgy (as was confessed)
been Idolized? Hath there been so much notorious super-
stitious usage of it, in so much that it is become an Image

of Jealousies; and can the *Communion* in the *Worship* (alledge-
ed to be) thereby miniftred be denyed to scandalize even
from the nature of the *Act*, being terminated in a *finfull*
Matter ? And 3. What though I yield you that the *offence*
in question, doth proceed, not from the nature of the *Act*,
but from the *Ignorance* and *Weaknesse* of the *Offended* ? will
you, or any man dare to averr that there shall be no *Indul-*
gency granted in the case ? what do you think of my *In-*
stance in the *Primitive Times* ? *Jerub-baal* Page 54. The
Scandal or *Offence* accrewing to the *Weak* from the *Indif-*
ferent *Use* of *Meats* in the *Stronger* Christians, did not
(properly) result from the nature of the *Act*, which was
(undoubtedly) *Lawful*, being an *Act* of *Christian Liberty*
and *Freedom* purchased by *Christ* for them in the *Case* ;
but from the *Ignorance* and *Weaknesse* of the *Scandalized* or
Offended, (else they should never have been recorded for
Weak Brethren) it being proper to the *strongest* to be of-
fended from a *Real Cause*, as the nature of the *Offenders*
Act), and yet say, if *Non-Indulgency* in that case was not
Sin in the *stronger* Christians, (yea and the *Sin* was so much
the greater, by how much they had of *Mr. Crostons* (confes-
sed) *sensiblenesse* and *forefight*) else to what purpose are the
many *Laws* enacted by the *Apostle* (*Rom. 14. 13, 15,*
21. 1 Cor. 8. 9, 13.) ? And to what purpose was his
own *Personal Resolve* (*1 Cor. 8. 13.*) in the case ? This is
an *Instance* which nor you (as *Learned* as you are) nor your
Patriark neither, are like in haste to give satisfaction in,
though by you passed over, *also silentio*, without the least
mention ; and why ? let the impartial Reader judge,
comparing your *Reply* with *Jerub-baal*, Page 53, 54. And
remember Sir, I plead for no more *Liberty*, than what
Scripture-Precept and *Example* challengeth, (*Childrens*
Bread! Again 4. By your Principle there can be no *In-*
dulgence shewed towards the *Weak* in Matters of *Indiffer-*
ency, for that *Act* cannot be in its nature *Offensive*, which is
in its nature *Lawfull*, and such is every *Indifferent Act*
(*quà Indifferent*) which therefore can never be supposed to
scandalize, as such, and by any *Natural Influence* or *Resul-*
tancy

rancy, but only by *Accident, Ex parte Subjecti*, by reason of the *Weakness* or *Ignorance* of the *Offended*; and yet *Non-Indulgence* of the weak in cases of *Indifferency* were flatly repugnant to the great *Canons Apostolique*, just now quoted: But you mutter *Duty*. *Ans.* This Sir is *Scer Sheldens Dialect*: were words, proofs, then--*actum* off; my cause were lost: Good Sir, Create no more *Duties* than he that created you hath done; leave this to our good *Lords Spiritual*; ask them, Is a *Liturgy* or *Common-Prayer*, a Thing in it self *Indifferent*? Yes; and are not the *Weak* to be *indulged* in Matters of *Indifferency*? Yes; and why not in *this*? why 'tis by *Law imposed*; yes, but if a thing in it self *Indifferent*, and that which will *scandalize*, why *imposed*? Oh Lord! what severity is this? *Cajetan* could say, That in case of *Scandal* we are to abstain *A Spiritualibus, non Necessariis*, and (for shame) will an *English Prelate* grudge us the *Liberty* which would not a *Romish Cardinal*? *Scrupulous Weaklings* are (they grant) in Things *Indifferent* to be *Indulged*, but by reason of severe *Impositions*, there is nothing left *Indifferent*; Ergo by reason of severe *Impositions*, the *Weak* shall not be *indulged*; is this *Charity*? or is it *Sacrilege*? reconcile this (if you can) to the *Law of God*,--*Et eris mihi magnus Apollo*. *Communion*, &c. say you is *Duty*; but how? It is an *Act* of *Obedience* to a *Humane*, but can you say to a *Divine Law*? alas! we are like to be pestered with such *Duties* as this is: To which of Gods ten *Categories*, i. e. *Commandments*, can you reduce it? *Communion* with the Church of *England* in all the parts of Christs *Instituted Worship*, is indispensably *Necessary*; let the *Liturgy-Worship* be proved to be such, and then I will *joyn issues* with you, and conclude, that *Communion* therein is *Duty*; and *Non-Communion*, *Schisms*; else I am warranted to deny both.

4. CONCLUSION; *Communion* (then) with the Church *Causus*. of *England* in her *Common-Prayer*, i. e. The *Worship* ministered by the *Liturgy*, is no *Duty*, and (therefore) *Non-Communion* with her in it, is no *Schisme* (which is always a * *Causeless Separation* from Christs *Instituted Worship* in a

true Church) Nay, *Communion* &c. is the *Sin*, and *Non-Communion* the *Duty* ; This *Sir* necessarily follows, and flows from the Premises ; from which it is evident that *Common-Prayer* or the *Liturgy-Service* (considered as above) is none of Christ's *Instituted Worship* ; but meer *Will Worship*, totally *Superstitious*, *Intrinsically Corrupt* and *Adulterate* ; a sufficient bar, obstruction *Moral*, and *Superficial* as to *Communion*, not only warranting, but (by your own confession, (Page 11.) necessitating a *Separation*. These are the *Articles* of my *Creed*, touching the *Communion* in question : And now *Sir*, where are your faint mincing *Sinners* of *stinking fish*, *poiled water*, *unclean Vessel*, &c ? Where is your *three-hair Notion* of *Communion* in the *Liturgy*, and *Communion* in the *Worship* ministered by the *Liturgy* impertinent (give me leave to say it) to our case, we being resolv'd into a *Lay-Capacity* ? Where is your self-pleasing distinction of *Corruptions Intrinsical* and *Extrinsical* ? and that, of the *Substance* and *Ministerial Mode* of *Worship* ? which, how little they contribute to your Cause, let others judge. And thus I hope the first *Query* is satisfied. I shall conclude all with two passages ;

* Quoted by the Presbyterian Divines

in their unanswered Reply to those of the Episcopalsides: An. 1661. Page 26.

† Quicumque invident bonis ut quarant occasiones excludendi eos, aut degrading, vel Crimina sua sic defendere parati sunt, ut etiam Conventiculorum Congregationes, vel Ecclesie perturbaciones, cogitent excitare, jam Schismatici sunt. Cited by Smectonum, in Smect. Motiv. Page 64.

One out of Mr. * *Hales*—"The limiting of *Church-Communion* to things of doubtful *disputation*, hath been in all in their unanswerable Reply to those of the Episcopalsides: An. 1661. Page 26. "Ages the ground of *Schism* and *Separation*, and he that "Separates from suspected *Opinions* (I add *Practices*) is not "the (Faulty) *Separatist* : The other out of St. † *Augustine*, *Quicumque*, &c. "Who soever (saith he) envy those that are "good (the *Malignant humor* of our Age) and seek occasions "to exclude and degrade them, and are so ready to defend "their faults, that rather than they will leave them, they "will devise how to raise up troubles in the Church, and "drive men into *Conventicles* and *Corners*, they are the "Schismatics : Let St. *Augustine* then be Judge, who are the greatest *Schismatics* in *England* at this day.

Quest. 2.

Quest. 2. What is That which may warrant and acquit from

from *Schism* a Persons *Non-Communion* with the Church of England in the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, under the preient *Mode, Manner, and Method of Administration*?

Ans. The *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* is one of Christs *Fundamental Institutions*, and (therefore) a *Substantial Part* of *Real-Solemn-Divine Worship*; but yet its *Corrupt Appendages*, and *Mode, Manner and Method of Administration*, the *Adulterate Mixtures* of *Pharisaical Leaven* with the *Sacramental Bread*, the known *Violence* of *Imposition*, the *Will-Worship* and *Superstition* which attend the Celebration thereof in the Church of England, insomuch that one cannot communicate therein *without sin*, one cannot partake of the *Sacrament*, but he must partake of *Superstition* too, doth abundantly warrant and acquit from *Schism*, yea, necessitate a Persons *Non-Communion* therein; this being a *Real-Inevitable Necessity*, which is granted to be a *Warrantable Superseas* in the Case; under which one may rest assured, that God will have mercy, though Man cannot offer sacrifice. Sir, The *Sacrament* is a *Priviledge* (and onely *ceteris paribus* a *Duty*) but *Superstition* is *sin*; now I may in some Cases warrantably waive a *priviledge*, but nothing can warrant my commission of the least *sin*; thus for fear of * *Poison*, I deny my self food; * *Inferit* The case is very hard (as I told my † *Friend*) but what shall I do? If I must dye, let me dye by *Famine* as soon as by *interfic.* *Poyson*; If I must be forty years without a *Passover* (the † *Terrib-ly*, page 42. time that the *Israelites* were in the *Wildernesse* without theirs) the *Will of the Lord* be done: I had rather be in the *Wildernesse* without it, than go back to *Egypt* for it, while I know that I am in the *high-way* towards *Canaan*; not forgetting St. Bernards *Maxim*, --- *Non privatio, sed contemptus damnat*; the want of a *Sacrament* is my *affliction*, but the *Contempt* of it onely (under that want) is my *sin*; but God forgive the *Hophnis* and *Phinehas*'s of our Age, who make the *Lords Offering* to be *abhorred*: 'Tis bad, but just, (alas! too just) just but not desperate: I cannot be a *Guest* at the *Lords Table*, 'tis well I may be a *Guest* in his *House*; I am barred from a *Supper*, 'tis well I may be admit-

Ezek. 47. 3.
Rev. 22. 2.

admitted to a *Feast*: Mat. 22. (good *Pasture* for way-faring Souls!) What though the *waters* of the *Sacruary* be sunk *Ankle-deep*? What though our *Monthly fruit* be intermitted? one *Pipe* is cut, but the *Spring* is not *stop*; while the *Fountain* is full can my *Cistern* be *empty*? Why may not *Verbum Dominus* be enjoyed in *Verbo Domini*? The *Fountain of Life* can convey himself by a *single*, as plentifully, as by a *divided* Channell; There is a *Real participation* of the blessed *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, (in *Verbo audibili*) in the *Word* preached, as well as a *Sacramental* (in *Verbo visibili*) at the *Supper*. See *Origen* in *Joh. tom. 15*. This is my comfort, though I may not be *His Guest* (there), yet he hath promised to be *mine*, Rev. 3. 20. *Table Communion* with the *Members* I am barred from, but not from *Real-Communion* with *Christ the Head*, who can work *without*, whatever he doth work *with Means*; *Omnipotency* is not tied to a *Sacrament*: Here must I with *patience* rest satisfied, till God enlarge my *pastures*, by returning upon me *forfeited Priviledges*; And who knows how soon a *New Tide* may swell our *Low-water* into a *River unpassible*? and the *departed Glory* may return to our *poor Israel*? When *Englands Moon* may renew her *Light* by her *Monthly Conjunction* with the *Sun of Righteousnesse*? when God shall give *fixed Lights* for *Wandering Stars*, *John-Baptists* for *unfavoury Sals*? when He shall make *David* to rejoyce with *Zadock*, and Both with the *People* in the (once endangered) true *Ark*? when the (now scattered) *Flock* of *Christ* shall be *homerced* in the happy *Conduct* and *Joynt-Guidance* of *Moses* and *Aaron*? -- *Quod faxit Deus!* But

Ezek. 47. 5.

Vid Origen
Hom. 23. super Num. Cap. 28.
Jude 13.
Mat. 5. 13.

Psal. 77. 20.

Pag. 27, 28.

Object. What *Superstition* and *Corruptions* attend the *Ministration* of the *Lords Supper*, in which he must personally *act* so as to become *guilty* of the same? *Ans. 1.* Two I shall only name, the *Service* and the *Gesture*; *Common-Prayer* and *Kneeling*; touching which there are these three *Postulata*, *Viz. 1.* Whether they be *superstition* or *Corruptions*? 2. VWhether they be such as *Communicants personally act* in? And 3. VWhether they attend the *Ministration* of the *Lords Supper* in the *Church of England*?

As

As to the first, That *Common-Prayer* or the *Service* exhibited, is meer *Superstition* and *Will-Worship*, hath been abundantly proved : That *Kneeling* in the Church of England (her *Sacramental* Gesture) is (at least) *superstition*, hath been fully evicted by the * *Godly Learned*, is generally agreed upon amongst the more sober Reformed, may appear from the very *imposition* of it ; of which by and by. * See the Diss. *pass* against the English *Po-pish Ceremonies*. Part 3. ch. 4.

As touching the Second, That those who *communicate* in *Common-Prayer*, or the *Worship* therein exhibited, do personally all therein, and contract *guilt* by so doing, (it being supposed as it is (proved to be) *superstition* and *Will-Worship*) I wonder if any doubt : Is not *Personal Communion* a *Personal Act* ? and doth not a *Personal Act*, if *sinful*, infer *Personal Guilt* ? what more plain ? That the very addition of an *Amen* (a note of *suffrage* and Badge of *Communion* sufficient under the *purest Administrations*, (1 Cor. 14. 16.) as hath been said above) is a *Personal Act*, none can deny. Again, that *Kneeling* is (*actio supposita*) a *Personal Act*, none can so much as once question.

As touching the Third, That the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, is not administered in the Church of England without (the *strange* fire in question) *Common-Prayer*, none can be a *stranger* to, in this our *Israel* ; It is (alas !) too well known to this Generation : That *Kneeling* is the *Imposed Sacramental Gesture* of the Church of England, witness the * *Canon* by me quoted in *Jerub-baal*. But (say * *Can. 27. An. you*) the *Legality* of the *Canon* is questioned, the *Imposition* Dom. 1503. is capable of a dispute ; the *Rubrick* seems to do little more Pag. 28. than commend the *Gesture*. *Ans.* That's strange ! Do but consult King *James's Proclamation* printed with the Book of *Canons*, *An. Dom. 1603.* compare that with the *Statute* or *Act* of *Parliament*, made XXVo. *Henrici VIII.*, therein referred to, and both with the late *Act* of *Uniformity*, Page 88. and then I believe you will wave your dispute : The *Rubrick* directs the *Elements* to be delivered to the people, *meekly*, kneeling, but alas ! that intimates only the *qualification* of the *Act*, not the *freedom* of the *Agent* or *Communicant*, witness sad Experience. Sir, this :

this is a needless debate : Read over what concerns *Communion* in the *Book*, and you shall find these words, *It is ordained (mark that) for the Administration of the Lords Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; yea, and three or four times is this Gesture enjoyned them therein; what need many words then? The Common-Prayer-Book ordains and enjoyns Kneeling, and the (late) Act of Parliament enjoyns the Prayer-Book: Is it not imposed then? Oh! that Men should bind where God looseth! Sir, the Latitude you upbraid me with, I own, and yet have not swallow wide enough for Common-Prayer, &c. I could go neer (said I) to approve of the Gesture of Kneeling, being left Arbitrary, and commended or practised only as an Outward Badge of more than Ordinary thankfulness, under the reception of an Extraordinary Blessing, and not as an act of Piety, Necessity, or Worship: where 1. The Assertion is not peremptory, but argues a kind of suspense. 2. That which is intimated is not my own Personal Act, but only a condescending allowance of the Gesture in others, and that 3. Upon Condition that all those things be excluded, which might render the Gesture superstitious (a fair Latitude! now those are the Qualifications mentioned, viz. Piety, Necessity, and Worship; from which the Gesture when Imposed can never be excused, for Quacunq; Observatio quasi necessaria commendatur continuo censetur ad cal-*

* *De vera E-* tum Dei pertinere, saith * *Calvin*; so that it can never be
cles. Reform. (no not by its best Advocates) acquitted from superstition.
Pag. 367. But,

2. *Ad hominem.* 1. Corruptions in point of Gesture are (belike) to Mr. *Crofton* a (confessed) warrantable ground of Non-Communion, *Pag. 28.* But Corruptions in poynt of Gesture are Corruptions Extrinsicall and Circumstantial; Ergo, Some Corruptions Extrinsicall and Circumstantial, are a warrantable ground of Non-Communion, viz. Partial and Negative at least, (and what is mine other?) which is repugnant to what is asserted in *Pag. 11.* Viz. that VVorship attended (but) with Circumstantial Corruptions (as is That in question) may with safety, and
must

must in Duty, be used. 2. *A fortiori*, if *Corruptions* in point of *Gesture* (which is in it self but a matter of *Indifference*) be a warrantable ground of *Non-Communion* in the *Lords Supper*, which is a *substantial Part* of *Instituted Worship* (as is contended) then surely much more are *Corruptions* in the *Mean, Manner, and Form* of *Worship*, such as is the *Liturgy*, (your *formal positive evil*) a sufficient *Bar Moral*, and warrantable ground of *Non-Communion* in the *Worship* by it ministr'd, which is p oved to be (in the sense aforesaid) no Part of *Christ's Instituted Worship*, but meer *Will-Worship*. Good Sir, revise your pleas and see what they will make for your purpose: The *Worship of God* doth exist for *Substance* under the *Liturgy*; and doth not the *Worship of God* (as well) exist for *Substance* under the *Sacramental Modes and Methods* in question? *Kneeling* is a *Personal Act*, and therefore derives upon the *Actor*, *Personal guilt*; and is not *Personal Communion* in the *Liturgy-Worship* (or the *Addition* of your *Indispensable Amen*, the *Declarative* thereof) a *Personal Act* too? and therefore infer *Personal Guilt* of *superstition* and *Will-Worship*? I hope Sir, you will henceforth acquit my *Non-Communion* in the *Sacrament*, &c. from *Schism*, since I do not only *withdraw* because of *Corruptions*, but am *with-held* from it by *Violence*, which belike will justify your *Non-Communion* in the Case, and why not mine Sir, *pari ratione*?

Quest. 3. Whether the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England* being (supposed to be) *Unlawfull*, *People* may (yet) *lawfully communicate* in the *Service or Worship* (said to be) thereby exhibited? Quest. 3.

Ans. That the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England*, is an *Unlawfull Constitution*, is agreed upon between Mr. *Crofton* and me, and my Three (self-regulating) *Maxims*, applied thereunto, (viz.

1. *Ecclesiastical Constitutions*, that are not *Usefull*, are *Unlawfull*.

2. *Ecclesiastical Constitutions*, that are not *Needfull*, are *Unlawfull*.

3. That *Constitution of Worship* which is not (in *genere*,

at least) commanded, is forbidden.) are by him, (or by you Sir in his name) readily, and (I must needs say) ingeniously,

† Let none then boast be-
yond measure
on the one
side, as if they
had gained
a Profelyte,
nor stumble
on the other
as if Mr. Crof-
ton had staved
Truth; to use
his own
words, Ref.
not Sep. pag.
2.

† admitted, Page 24. nay 'tis expressly termed by you Unlawfull, Page 26, 27. &c. yea, a Positive Evil, Page 39. So that the Question between us now, is That now stated; which I resolve in the Negative; People cannot lawfully communicate in the Worship ministred by the Liturgy, it being (granted to be) Sinfull or an Unlawfull Constitution; for (to use but one Argument),

That Worship onely can People lawfully communicate in, which is performable out of a Principle of Faith (i. e. a firm persuasion of the Agreeableness of it to the Will of Christ, Assistance in it from the Spirit of Christ, and Acceptance of it, for the Merits of Christ.)

But the Worship ministred by the Liturgy being (supposed to be) Sinfull or Unlawfull, is not performable out of a Principle of Faith, &c.

ERGO

The Worship ministred by the Liturgy being (supposed to be) Sinfull or Unlawfull, People cannot lawfully communicate in.

The Major-Proposition of this Syllogisme, is bottomed upon that great Maxim Apostolique, *non est in virtute apostolica ista*, Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin, Rom. 14.

23. The Catholique Rule of Conscience, the great Law of Purity; Whatsoever a man doth without this Plerophory of Conscience, or firm persuasion of the lawfulness thereof, of its Agreeableness to the Word the Rule of Worship, and (thereupon) its Acceptableness to God the Object, is sin;

Prayer without this is sin; Supplications, meet Provocations; Incense without this, a kind of strange-fire: Hence saith * Calvin, *Nefas omnino est*, &c. 'Tis altogether Un-

lawfull for thee to attempt That which thou art not persuaded, will please God, as well as That which thou thinkest may displease him: And † Pagani, All true Worship is factus in fide, statuente, quod Persona et Opus placeat Deo, &c. performed in Faith; with this determination and persuasion, that both Person and Service is acceptable to God; and again, *Quicquid non est ex fide, peccatum est*, &c. "Whatso-

* *Nefas omnino est, quippiam aggredi quod putes (Domino) displicere, imo quod non persuasus sit illi placere.*
In Rom. 14.
† In *Orism.*
Par. 3. Quest.
96.

ever

"ever is not of faith, is sin; but ('tis by him assumed)
 "He who attempts the performance of any *Worship* to
 "God, with a *Conscience* in the mean time not persuaded
 "or doubting, whether it be Gods *Will* that He should be
 "worshipped after such a manner, doth not act out of
 "faith, because he knows not whether his *Service* be plea-
 "sing or displeasing to God, (yea) and is guilty of contempt
 "towards God, &c. And O! how sad is it when our very
 "Duties are thus besien'd, and our very *Acts* of Obedience be-
 "come *Acts* of Iniquity! Thus the first Proposition is clear
 both from Scripture, and humane Testimony.

As touching the *Minor-Proposition*, viz. The *Worship*
 ministered by the *Liturgie* being (supposed to be) *Sinfull* or *Unlawfull*, is not performable out of a Principle of Faith, or a
 firm persuasion of the *Agreeableness* of it to the *Will* of
 Christ, &c. The truth of it is implied in terminis, and what
 Judicious Person will not easily discern it?

That *Worship* is performable from a Principle of Faith and
 firm persuasion of the *Agreeableness* of it, to the *Will* of Christ,
 which is ministered by Means, and after a Manner institu-
 ted and appointed by Christ;

But the *Worship* which is ministered by the *Liturgie*, it being
 (supposed to be) *Sinfull* or *Unlawfull*, is not (surely) mini-
 stered by Means or after a Manner instituted and appointed by
 Christ: (else why do you grant it to be an *Unlawful Constitution*?) (why do you term it a *Formal Positive Evil*?) ERGO

The *Worship* ministered by the *Liturgie* it being (supposed to
 be) *Sinfull* and *Unlawfull*, is not performable from a Princi-
 ple of Faith, or firm persuasion of the *Agreeableness*
 of it to the *Will* of Christ. Sir you intimate (Page 25.)
 that Superstition and Will-Worship is a sufficient and war-
 rantable ground of Non-Communion in the *Worship* mini-
 stered by the *Liturgie*, and hath it not been abundantly
 proved that the *Worship* ministered by the *Liturgie*,
 is no other? Hath it not been made to appear that, It
 is flat contrary to Gods *Will-Regulative* of all Instituted
Worship in the second Commandment? And to the Gospel
 his last Commentary thereupon? These considered, who

can say, That *Common-Prayer* or the *Worship* ministred by the *Liturgy* is performable from a principle of *Faith*? What *Fundamentum Fidei* is there herein? The *Medium* is *illicitum*, the *Liturgy* is by you granted to be *Sinfull* and *Unlawfull*, the *Worship* by it ministred, is proved to be meer *Superstition* and *Will-worship*; who then can beleieve the *Agreeableness* of it to the *Will* of Christ? Who can hope for *Assistance* in it from the *Spirit* of Christ (as if the *Holy Ghost* were an *Assistent*, where he is not an *Author*)? Who can expect the *Acceptance* of it for the *Sake* or *Merits* of Christ? Who knows not that God must be sought, and will be found onely in his *Own way*? *Duty* is the *Method* of *Blessing*, and the *Word* is the *Rule* of *Duty*; *Promised Blessings* are conveyed in a *Prescribed Manner*; so that as no *Prayer* can be *Acceptable* to God, but what is (for *Mean* and *Manner* at least) *Agreeable* to his *Will*, so That *Prayer* onely which is *Agreeable* to his *Will*, can be *successful* and *profitable* to us. From hence it is evident, that if the *Liturgy* be (once granted what it hath been proved to be, viz.) *Sinfull* and *Unlawfull*; *Communion* in the *Worship* by it ministred, must needs be *Unlawfull* also, which was my *Questum*.

But

Object. 1. The *Liturgy* is onely a *Ministerial Mode* (which the *People* are not to be *Judges* in) and therefore all the guilt resulting from thence, is *Personal*, i. e. peculiar to the *Minister*. *Ans.* This twenty year-old *Notion* is (it seems,) become the *Ninth Article* of Mr. *Croftons Creed*, (Page 15) but there is little reason for such a *Faith*; for Sir, 1. The *Liturgy* is denied to be in your sense a *Ministerial Mode* (more than the *Book of Scriptures* is in the *Ministers Publique Reading* of the *Word*, which none can say, is a meer *Ministerial Mode*, but one of Gods own *Instituted Means*) being *Populare Medium Culm*, a *Popular Mean* of *Worship*, whereby the *Minister* doth in the *Name*, and as the *Mouth* of the *People* officiate, and Both *Minister* and *People*, do joyntly communicate in the *Worship* by it ministred; whereas Sir, the *Ministerial Mode*, that which is peculiar to him as the *Publique Teacher* and

Com-

Page 15.

26, 40, &c.

* See Mr.

Bills Tryal of

the grounds

tending to

Separation.

Chap. 8. & 9.

Common-Mouth of his *Hearers* (if I understand any thing) consists in due *Method* and *Order*, *Edifying Expressions*, *Suitable Affections*, a *Reverential Manner* of *Delivery*, &c. *Modifications*, directed in *ge-ere*, under the *Rules* of *Edification* and *Order*, (whereof I have spoken above, Page 18, 19.) Now are those the same with a *Fixed Liturgy*, a *Set-Form*, and *fixed Frame* or *Means* of *VVorship*, strictly imposed both upon *Ministers* and *People*? 2. The *Popish Missal* may be termed a *Ministerial Mode*, as well as the *English Liturgy*, now if the *guilt* resulting from the *Ministerial Mode* in your sense be *Personal* onely, and not *Popular*, what reason can be shewed why they are more chargeable with *Idolatry*, who joyn with a *Romish Priest* in the *VVorship* ministred by the former, then they are with *Superstition* who joyn with an *English Priest* under the latter? It is said, there is That in the *Missal* which nullifieth the *Ordinance*; thereby *Prayer is made to Saints* a *wrong Object*; in the name of *Saints* a *wrong ground*; for some *unlawful things*, *wrong matter*, &c. I answer, true, but what is this to the purpose? *Popular guilt* here must be determined by *Popular Communion*, viz. *Popish* by *Communion* in *Idolatrous*, *English* by *Communion* in *Superstitious VVorship*; now then, If *Popish Communicants* contract the guilt of *Idolatry* by joyning with their *Priest* in the *Worship* ministred by their *Idolatrous Missal*, surely *parrations*, *English Communicants* must likewise contract the guilt of *Superstition* by joyning with their *Priest* in the *Worship* ministred by their *Superstitious Liturgy*, for such you grant it to be Page 31. thus Sir, you may see, your antiquated Notion of *Ministerial Mode* will not serve to acquit your *Communion* in the *VVorship* exhibited by the *Liturgy*, from the blot of *Superstition*; else you may as well acquit *Romish Communicants* under or by their *Idolatrous Missal*, from the ignominious brand of *Idolatry*. O Sir! That's a dangerous principle; That *People* may lawfully communicate by, that *Form*, *Mode*, or *Order* of *VVorship*, which (yet) a *Minister* cannot lawfully (i. e. by any warrant from the *VVord* of *God*) officiate or administer by; Such

• Quoted by the Lord
Faithland, in
his Speech to
the House of
Commons,
printed 4s.
1661.
1 Thes. 5. 22.

Such *Opinators* do in their *Practices*, fondly try an experiment, *Quam propè ad peccatum sine, peccato licet accedere* (as Sir *Thomas Moor* is reported to have said of the *Casuists*), how near an *Approach* may be made to sin, without sin: we see this to abstain from all appearance of *Evill*. But 3. The *People* as well as *Ministers* are *Judges* in *Acts* and *Matters of Worship*, (*Masters* and *Judges* (at least) of their own *Actions* by your own words, Page 41.) though not by a *Publicke* Judgement which is peculiar to *Church-Guides*, yet by a *Private*, common to all professed *Church-Members*; though not *Judicio Directionis*, by a Judgement of *Direction* proper to the *Ministerial Office* and *Capacity*; yet *Judicio Discretionis* by a Judgement of *Discretion*, whereby they do as *Private Judges* in their *Popular Capacity*, judge, though not of the *Magis* and *Minus*, in matters tending to *Edification*, not of *Order* and *Method* (which belongs to the *Minister*) yet of the *Lawfulness* or *Unlawfulness* of (the *Media Cultus*) the *Publicke Means* and *Manner of Worship* (as of the *Liturgy* in question) wherein they are concerned as *Fellow-Worshippers* and *Joynt-Communicants* with the *Minister*; and Both are subject to the *Judicium Decisionis*, the Judgement of *Authoritative Decision* peculiar to the *Written Word of God*, that *Infalible Oracle*, the *Supream Judge of Controversies*, the *Adequate Rule of Faith and Manners*, by whose *Tast* the *Liturgy* in question being tryed, is found *Faulty* and *Sinfull* by the *Jury of Twelve Apostles*; by whose *Sentence* *Definitive*, the *Worship* by it ministered, is *condemned* as none of *Christs Instituted Worship*, but *Spurious*, *Adulterate*, a very *Compound of Superstition*, and *Will-Worship*; *Quare Doctrina a vobis tradita, &c.* (that I may conclude this in the name of all that are of my Judgement with the words of the famous *† Zanchy*) *Wherefore our Doctrine remains firm and unmoveable*, namely, *Non licere nobis* (he saith not, *Non licere Pastori*) &c. 'Tis *Unlawfull for us* (for the *People* as well as for the *Minister*) to worship God by any other *Manner, Means, or Forms* of outward *Worship* than what himself hath by his *Apostles prescribed* in his *Word*. Object.

+ Quam do-
ctrina a vobis
tradita, non li-
cere nobis alia
Externi Cul-
tus Ceremonia,
Deum colere,
quam quam ipse
in sacra litera
prescripsit fir-
ma ac certa ma-
ner. De Cultu
Dei Exter.
Col. 434.

Object. 2. *Under this Ministerial Mode, the Members of the Church are purely passive.* *Answ.* Your Note of Ministerial Mode, you still retain, as touching That consider what hath been said. 2. What *Worship* under the Sun, are Communicants *active* in; if such are not in the *Worship* in question, who cannot deny their *Amen* to any of the *Petitions* of the *Common-Prayer* ? But it hath been declared above, that the very addition of an *Amen*, is the Communicants *All*, *Personal All*; what? and is he yet *passive*? *purely passive*? *Active* in his *Amen*, and yet *passive* in the *Worship*? strange! By this time it may appear that Mr. Croftons *Alms* to the *City-Recorder* and *Speaker* in *Parliament*, is but faint, and soon dash'd; What if his *Majesty* should confine Both, to a *Certain Rule, Order, and Manner* of delivery, and certain *Qualifications*, and *Conditions*, as that they should both deliver their *Petitions* by *heart*, not by *Paper* or *Reading*, and that in an *Order* and *Method* directed; and all this with a *Promise* of grant, upon condition his own *Rule, Order, and Directions*, be observed, and with *threats* of denial, if they be not? would you not in such a Case say, that If the *Kings Rule, Order, and Directions*, were not observed by them, (as if they should read their *speeches*, instead of delivering them by *heart*, and chuse to themselves a *manner of delivery* or *petitioning*, as they themselves should think fit) 'twere just they and the *Parliament* and *City*, whose *Mouths* they are, should be denyed the requested *Privilege*? I leave you to apply.

Pag. 3. 40.

Object. 3. *The Sons of Eli failed in the Ministration of Gods Worship, taking their own part, before they had burnt the fat, according to Gods own appointment, and yet the People never durst leave the offerings of the Lord.* *Answ.* 'Tis no wonder, that the *Israelites*, notwithstanding the horrid prophaneness and Corruption of *Hophni* and *Phinehas* (for which they did *loath*, yet) durst not leave the *Lords Offerings*, for they were by God *consigned*, as to a certain *Place of worship*, so to the *Ministration* of a certain *Order* of *Persons*, viz. the *Levitical Priests*, of which number were *Elys*

Ely's two wicked Sons (as well as himself) *Hophni* and *Phinehas*, by whose prophane hands (therefore) they were obliged to offer their *Sacrifices*: Now what doth this make for *Communion* with our now *Church-Officers* under their *Corrupt Administrations*? Unless it be proved (which I dare say you will never once attempt) that *Christians* (VVe) are by the Law of God confined to the *Ministration* of the *Episcopal Order* under the *New*, as the *Jewes* were confined to the *Ministration* of the *Levitical Order* under the *Old Testament*; which *Levitical Priesthood*, and fixed *Ministration* was sixteen hundred years agoe, by Christ abolished, *Heb. 7. 12.* 'Tis strange that a person of your Abilities, should once object the Case of *Ely's Sons* in the present debate! The most that is or can be pleadable for *Communion* under the *Corrupt Ministration* of our *Hophnies* and *Phinehas's*, is only a *Humane*, not (as of old) a *Divine Constitution*. Other Particulars I could instance in, for proof of the disparity that is between our Case, and That of the *Jewes*, but that I study brevity; and this may suffice.

Your *Plea* then from *Ely's Sons &c.* is equally impertinent to our Case, with that from the *Israelitish Sacrifices* in the *High-Places*; the disparity between whose Case and Ours, I did in † *Jerub-baal* shew in three particulars, viz.

† Pag. 44.
45, 46. 1. In *Judah* (even) under Reforming Governments, the *High-Places* were (indeed) retained; but in *England*, *Superstition* and *Will-Worship* is after sacred-solemn *Expulsion*, restored & returned. To this you reply, *Restoration may aggravate, but doth not change the nature of the Corruption.* Ans. Though *Restoration* changeth not the nature of the *Corruptions*, Objectivè, as *Liturgie*, *Ceremonies*, &c. yet *Restoration* after *Solemn Expulsion*, changeth the nature of *Personal Guilt* or *Sin*, Subjectivè, thus the very *Use* and *Retention* of the *Liturgie* is *Superstition*; but the *Restoration* of the *Liturgie* and *Retention* of it, after *sacred* and *solemn Expulsion*, (contrary to *Personal Obligations*) is (you know) not only *Superstition*, but *Perfidy*; thus the *Quality* of the *Guilt* is chang'd: and this (alas!) is our Case. 2. The *Israelites* were confined to

Gods

Gods Altar by a *Positive Law*, which they should have *transgressed* had they *deserved* it because of the *High-Places*; God having determined upon the *place*, as well as the *manner* of his *Worship* in the *Jewish*, which he did not in the *Christian Church*; But so (say you) *Christians are confined to Gods Worship in certain Assemblies*. *Ans.* True, but those *Assemblies* are not confined to any certain *Place*; *Locality* in reference to *Worship* being Matter of *Indifferency* under the *Gospel*, as is largely proved in *Jerm-baal*, P. 25, 26, 27. 3. Though the *High-Places* were *Idolatrous*, yet the *Worship* celebrated by the devout *Israelites* therein, was not *Idolatrous*; in a word, *where the Worship was good, the Place only bad*; but *here in England, the Place only is good, but the Worship (being meer Superstition and Will-Worship) is bad*. VVhat is here replied, is answered before: And thus *Sir*, both *Pleas* vanish.

Pag. 30.

Quest. 4. Whether One may be lawfully present in time of *Common-Prayer*, who (yet) cannot lawfully communicate in, or by, it? *Quest. 4.*

Ans. *Qui bene distinguit, bene docet*: *Presence* is one thing, *Communion* another; *Presence* is a *Civil, Communion* a *Religious Act*. Again, *Presence* is either, 1. *Arbitrary* and *Voluntary*, an Act of *Choice*, or 2. *Necessary* and *Compulsory*, the fruit of some Cogent Inevitable *Necessity*; or, 3. *Probational* and *Decisory*, (such was *Elijah's* presence amongst *Baal's* Prophets *sacrificing*, when he did *authoritatively prove* and *reprove* their *Sacrifices*, and cut off their *Persons* (1 King. 18.) which comes not into the Question in hand.) Lastly, *Common-Prayer*, the *Worship* in question, is (indeed) *Superstition*, but ('tis supposed) not *Idolatry*, neither That which, is forbidden in the first Commandment, such as *Heathenish*; nor That which is forbidden in the second, such as *Papish Idolatry*; which (therefore) consists with a *holding of the Head*, the contrary whereof could it have been proved, had saved me the labour, and the World the trouble, both of my *Remonstrance*, and of this present *Defense*; since (as is generally granted) *Idolatry* in poynt of *Worship*, as well as *Heresy* in poynt of *Doctrine*, is a *just Cause* (as of a Churches *Dissolve* from God, so) of a *Persons Departure* from a Church,

Ans.

Col. 2. 19.

Nature, which in such a case can be no *Schism*. These premised the Question is resolved in the *Affirmative*, viz. 'Tis *Lawful* for a Person to be *present* in time of *Common-Prayer*, who yet cannot *lawfully* communicate in or by it; and that you Sir, and others may know what *Presence* I mean, I shall here acquaint you: It must be

A Presence with a Judgment convinced that *Communion* with the *Church-Visible* in all Parts of the *Real-Solemn-Instituted Worship* of God, when *Opportunity* serves, that one may communicate, and nothing hinders but that one may *will* not sin, is an *Indispensable Duty*.

A Presence with a Judgment convinced, that the *Church of England*, notwithstanding her *Adulterate Mixtures* and *Innovations* in *Worship*, (yet) while she holds the *Head* Christ, is a *Part* of the *Church-Visible*, a *True* though not a *Pure Church*.

A Presence with a Judgment convinced, that That *Worship* only is agreeable to God, which is agreeable to his *Will*, and That *Worship* only is agreeable to his *Will* (under the Gospel at least) which is *fit* to his *Nature*, *Spiritual* as Himself is a *Spirit*, John 4. 23, 24.

* See *Con-*

Clem. Alex.

Stom. lib. 7.

A Presence with a Judgment convinced that *Common-Prayer* or the *Worship* instituted by the *Liturgy*, is no *Part* of *True Solemn Instituted VVorship*, but totally *Superstition* and *Will Worship*, &c (therefore) that *Non-Communion* therein, is no *Sin*, and consequently no *Schism*, no *breach* of *Duty*, but a *Duty*.

A Presence with a Judgment convinced that the *Essentials* or *Substantials* of true *Instituted Worship* are preserved and *Communion* therein publicly maintained in, *Consecration*, *Prayer*, *Praises*, and the *Word Read and Preached*.

A Presence with a heart (as afflicted with, so) afflicted for the *Corruptions* & *Innovations* of *Worship* in the *Church of England*; as the *Liturgy* with its *Anti-scriptural Appendants*, &c. A heart afflicted because there is so much of *Man's Work* done upon *God's Day*: A heart afflicted because, *Many Professors, Ministers* (and those *Godly, Learned, Eminent*) pretend to serve the true God, with *Needless Officers*, (charged by Mr. & Hooker upon *Superstitionaries*.) : An

Officers

+ Ecclef.
Polit. lib. 3,
Sect. 3,

Officious piece of *Will-Worship*, a *Sporious* and *Adulterate Service* (nick-named *Divine*) powerfully returned, wilfully retained, and violently imposed, after *Sacred* and *Solemn Expulsion*. But to be iure it must be

A Presence Necessary, not *Arbitrary* or *Voluntary*; The fruit of some *Cogent-Inevitable Necessity*, not an Act of *Choice*, or *Election*.

Quest. What is That *Necessity* which may warrant *presence* in the Church in time of *Common-Prayer*? *Ans.* The *Necessity* is twofold, viz. 1. *Necessitas Officii*. 2. *Necessitas Beneficii*. The First is bottomed upon *Duty*: The Second upon *Interest*. The first is *A Necessity of Obedience*: The Second *A Necessity of Advantage*.

Suppose We a *Law* to be enacted by the *King*, with the Consent of his Two *Houses of Parliament*, enjoying with all imaginable strictness and severity, One of those two disjunctively, viz. either *Communion* in the *Worship* ministr'd by the *Liturgy*; or (at least) *Personal Presence* in the Church, from first to last, and that under this penalty, namely, That those who did not fulfill the condition of the *Act* should be excluded from the benefit of all *Publicke Ordinances*: This were a *Mixt-Law*, partly *Civil*, partly *Sacred* and *Ecclesiastical*: Now in such a case, I should judge my self oblig'd to give my *Bodily Presence* in the Church, which is but a *Civil Act* in Obedience to the *Civil Part* of the *Law*; and yet refuse *Communion* in the *Worship*, which is a *Religious Act*, required by the *Sacred* and *Religious Part* of the *Law*: The *King* being *Dominus Suppositi*, the Lord of my *Person*, may challenge my *presence* in the Church, which is but a *Civil Station*, as a piece of *Civil Obedience*, due from a *Subject*; But God Himself onely, being *Dominus Anima*, (as * *Luther* calls him) the sole Lord of *Conscience*, can by virtue of an *Incommunicable Prerogative*, oblige to participation or *Communion* in *Worship*, which is the *Internal Act* of the *Soul*. -- † *Joh. 14. 23. Coenae*.

This *Necessity* enforced with the *Indispensable Need* of participation of *Publicke Ordinances*, the true *Instituted Worship* of *Christ* in the publicke Assembly, of enjoying God in his *Word*, or a *Soul-saving Sermon*, &c. and so becoming *Necessitas Complexa*, seems (to me) sufficient to warrant ones *Presence* in the time of *Common-Prayer*, who yet cannot communicate in, or by it: If then I should upon the account of this *Necessity* present my self in the place of publick Assembly in time of *Common-Prayer*, and that in order to the enjoying of *Gods own Ordinance*, (that ended,) let none

* *Com. in*
1 *Pet. 5. 3.*

† *Phocyl.*

from my Presence in the Place, Communion in the Worship; or interpret Attendance in the one, Allowance of the other, that were a manifest *Non-sequitur*; The God-fearing Israelites (the Priests and Levites themselves being of the number, 1 Chron. 16. 39.) did frequent the High-Places (viz. in case of Necessity) but that proves them not Partakers of the Superstition of those Places: Naamans servile Presence in the House of Rimmon being granted, will not prove him a Communicant in the Worship of Rimmon, 2 King. 5. 18. Sir, you may please to consult the Learned Commentators upon the place, *Cornelius a lapide*, and *Abulenfis, Burgenfis, Sanchez* and many others quoted by him; So * *Snarez*, so *Cajetan, Estius, Lyra, Grotius, Bientius*, (in loc.) and many more, who understanding the word *יָרַד* *de futuro* (though that sense be much opposed by others) interpret Naamans bowing, in the Temple of Rimmon, to be (not Religious Worship, exhibited to the Idol, but onely) Political or Civil Worship performed to the Syrian King (leaning upon him according to the (then) custome) whose Menial Servant he was, and the Prophets words, — *Go in peace*, to be a Concession and grant of the same, thereby declaring *Ilud licitum esse quod timebas esse illicitum* (saith *Lyra*) That to be Lawfull (viz. Presence and Civill Bowing in the Temple) which he feared was a sin, while he said, *The Lord pardon thy Servant*; which (saith he) is customary to tender Conferences. This case of Naaman I confesse was extraordinary, and no president to warrant (no nor) ones Presence in the time of Idolatrous Worship; for, In the time of That Worship on ly may we be lawfully present in Obedience to our Civil Head, the King, which is consistent with the holding of our Mystical Head, Christ; such is the English Common-Prayer, but not Heathenish or Popish Idolatry; so that by this Instance, according to the interpretation given, may be proved a fortiori, the lawfulness of ones presence in the time of Common Prayer (though he cannot communicate in or by it) in obedience to such a Law as hath been supposed, which is in such a case Civill and Servill performed in the Capacity of a Subject to his King. But is not that Presence, Approbation? Ans. No, That presence which is necessitated, and not a thing Eligible, the fruit of an Inevitable Necessity, and not an Act of Choice, can never be construed an Approbation, no nor so much as an Interpretative Consent, to use the words of Reverend on, Cha. 9. Mr. † *Ball*, my Learned Antagonist *Senior-Disputant*, But may not

* Trist.
de fide.
Disp. 14.
Sect. 4.
N. 8.

† See His
Trial of
the
Grounds
tending to
Separati-
on, Cha. 9.

not the weak be scandalized by that presence? *Ans.* 'Tis not probable, such a presence being given onely as a * Civil posture ^{Vid. Corn. a Lep. in 2. Reg. cap. 18.} and station, in obedience to the Civil Father of the Church, and which shall necessitate in order to the performance of true Worship, and the enjoying of Christ in his Own Ordinance, in the place ^{18.} (Common-Prayer ended) from which without it, I should be by the supposed Law debar'd; But if offence did accrew, it were purely taken, from a matter of Indispensable duty, &c.

What moved you Sir, to slander me so sowlly as you have done, Page 31 23 touching an Idol-Temple, Masse and Alchoran, I know not, but God knows mine innocency in the case, and let Man judge of it by comparing your Cavils and Allegations, with what is said in Jerub-baal, Page 45, 46 And with the whole scope both of my Remonstrance, and of this Defence; and then determine whether (tongue-struck) I, or (not to say you) your Fellow-Commoners are likeliest (in this respect) either to go back to Egypt, or to look back to Sodom, spiritually so called, Rev. 11. 8. I shall conclude this Question with a saying of Tertullian, pertinent to the case: *Utinam quidem, &c. Would God* (saith he) *twere Impossible* for our Eyes to see what is unlawful for us to do; and a little after, *Plane ad sacrificium, aut sacrificium vocatur, non ibo*; (I may english it) Verily were I required either to officiate or to communicate, I would refuse to go, — *Si propter sacrificium vocatus adistam, ero particeps Idolatriæ*; If I communicate, I shall be a Partaker of Superstition and Will-Worship, — *Si alia causa conjungat sacrificanti, ero tantum spectator sacrificii*, but if upon some other account (as the alleadged Case of Necessity) I be onely locally present, I shall be onely a Spectator of Superstition and Will-Worship. Vid. Lib. de Idolatria.

Quest. 5. Whether the Oath called The Solemn League and Covenant (supposed to be (as yet) in force and Obligatory) could oblige or bind against Communion in Common-Prayer? *Quest. 5.*

Ans. This Question touching that forbidden Argument, the COVENANT, that Threefold Cord twisted by Three Kingdoms, with hands lifted up to the Most High God; shall be briefly resolved in these gradual Conclusions, viz.

1. The Main Thing obliged to, by the Religious Part of that Sacred Oath (supposed to be still Obligatory and in force) is REFORMATION of RELIGION: This is the *Terminus Radicatus*, whither all Reforming Endeavours ought to be levelled, and ultimately resolved.

Now

2. The

2. The Reformation hereby obliged to, consists in the *Alteration* of some, and the *Abrogation* of other things, in *Dollrine* *Worship* and *Discipline*; *Dollrine* must be reformed; but *Heresie* must be abolished: *Worship* must be reformed; but *Superstition*, *Liturgie*, &c. must be abolished: *Discipline* must be reformed; but *Prelacy*, or *Episcopacy*, &c. *Schism*, &c. must be abolished: So that the Reformation of the former, must consist in a *Total Extirpation* of the latter. Hence

3. The Reformation of *Worship* obliged to by the *Covenant*, includes not the *Alteration*, but the *Total Abolition* and *Extirpation* of *Liturgie* and *Common-Prayer*; This Sir is (to me) evident from these 3 particulars, viz. 1. It was wholly abjured & totally exploded first by the *Honourable Court of Parliament*, the *Great Representative* of the Kingdom, (in which the sense and judgement of the whole Nation was *Legally* involved and declared) and then *Unanimously* by the *People*. 2. The *Confederates* in this *League*, do (in the presence of God) that they shall endeavour *restoring* the *Churches* of God in the *Three Kingdoms* to the nearest *Conjunction* and *Uniformity* in *Religion* (as in a *Confession of Faith* in opposition to *Papery*, &c. and *Form of Church-Government*, in opposition to *Prelacy*, &c. so) in a *Directory* for *Worship*, (namely, That of the *Assembly*, by *Approbation* and *Appointment* of *Parliament*, substituted in the room of and) in opposition to the *Liturgie*. 3. The *Example* that the *Vowed Reformation* must be patterned by, is That of the best Reformed Churches, whereby we must understand a Church or Churches free from a *Liturgie*, else the Church of *Scotland* was obliged to pattern by a Church or Churches more *Corrupt* than Her self; *Quod absurdum*.

4. This Reformation (and by consequence the *Abolition* of the *Liturgie*) must be pursued by all *Covenanting* Persons in their *several Places*, *Callings*, and *Capacities*, by *sincere*, *real* and *constant* Endeavours. From all which, followeth the *Affirmative* Resolution of the Case. viz.

5. This *Oath of God* (the *Covenant*) supposed to be still in force) doth oblige and bind all that took it, against *Communism*, by the *Liturgie* or in *Common-Prayer*: which what *Judicious* Person will not easily discern? I were obliged (were I a *Covenanteer*) *sincerely* *really*, and *constantly* to endeavour (in my Place and Calling) the *To-*

tal Abolition and Destruction of the Liturgy : now who can communicate by That which he is obliged in the sight of God, *quod posse*, to *abstain* ? Should not such a one plant what he is bound to *root up* ? and build what he is bound to *destroy* ? Allowance of the Liturgy can never consist with *zeal care and contest for Reformation* ; now, is not *Connivance* an Argument of *Affection* and *Allowance* ? and is not *Communion* an Argument of *Connivance* ? Yes Sir, 'tis by your own grant, pag. 33. What follows then (*a primo ad ultimum*) but that *Communion* by the Liturgy is inconsistent with *Zeal, Care, and Contest for Reformation* ? Sir, Your old *Salvo of Communion* in the Liturgy, and *Communion* in the *Worship* ministered by the Liturgy (the Reader be Judge) will now fail you. But,

Object. This *Reformation* is to be *endeavoured* only in our *several places*, &c. Now we have *endeavoured* it, and are at present *dispowered* from further Attempts. *Ans.* 1. The *Endeavour* must be (as *sincere* and *real*, so) *Constant* and *Un-interrupted*. 2. *Providence* is no *Rule to Conscience*, 'twas to them that measure *Conscience* or *Duty* by that *Rule*: *Opportunity* of *Positive Reformation* may fail, but the *Obligation* to a *Negative Reformation*, cannot. 3. *Jerub-baal* hath answered this (pag. 48, 49.) The *Covenant-Obligation* is partly *Positive*, partly *Negative*: Now the *Negative Part* oblieth *ad semper*; I cannot go on, yet, but I must never go back; my *Progress* is now *obstru'd*, but my *Regress* is not hereby warranted; my *Sun* is hindered in its *Course*, but let it stand still, rather than go back so much as *One*, much less, *Ten Degrees*; my *Positive Endeavours* are *ab extrinseco* obviated, so that I can not reform, but my *Personal Obligation* can never be violated, so that I must not *retreat* : Now *Non-Conformity* to the Liturgy, and *Non-Communion* in the *Worship*, are both of them Acts of *Negative Reformation*; the former, in a *Ministerial*, the latter, in a *Popular Capacity*; I have (I thank God) under a *Croud of Temptations* maintained the former, I distrust not but have (maugre your assaults) I shall the latter also: What then is required of a *Covenanting Clergy*, and *Laity* ? Art thou a *Minister* ? dare not to conform : Art thou a *Private Member* ? O fear to communicate : Art thou *Either* ? plead for neither; 'twere a *scandalous Professing*. Mr. *Croft* hath done valiantly in reference to the former; may he merit the like applause touching the latter.

My distinction *de Ecclesia reformata et reformanda*, you have disdainfully rejected, but why *unforgotten* Mr. *Repham* : Who will

will not distinguish between a Church Reformed, (though *un-
officially*) and a Church Relapsed (as This is)? A Church Relapsed, not
only from a *State*, but against *Vowes* of Reformation? In which case
Communion in the Liturgy were a Dog-like Return to the Old *Va-
mit*; a *Refutation* of our (once) demolished *High-Places*! *Aggravated Perjury*! which *Admonitions* alone is able to dash all your
Pleas from the Old *Non-Conformists*, Pag. 40. Good Lord for-
give *England's Mock-Reformation*! What? To *vow Repentance*, and
then to *repent* of that *Vow*! as if that had been *Rebellion*, this only,
Religion! as if an *Annua Fides* (such as *Hilary* upbaid the *Ar-
mans* with) an *Anniversary Faith*, were *Britains Characteristic*.

— *Quis talia fando*

Temperet a lachrymis? —

May *Jeihovah* (then) reduce our *Fugitive* (once) *Covenant-
Zealots*! May *Hezekiah* ever loath his accursed *Nebuchstan*, and
a fondling *People* their *Image of Jealousie*! May the Lord convince
P. P. P. P. that, *Covenant-Faithfulness* were a *Bow* in *England's*
Cloud; but *Perjury* a sad *Symptom* of an *Ichabod*! the lengthened
shadow of a declining *Sun*! (*Jer. 6. 4.*) May it never be said nor
seen, — *For breach of Oaths Britain mourneth.* But — 'tis dan-
gerous to eat of forbidden fruits.

Thus *Sir*, I have endeavoured (as briefly as the *Matter*, and as
fully as mine *Occasions* would permit) a *Defence* of my self and the
Truth and therein to take off (shall I say?) your *Judas-Kiss*, what o-
ther can I term your Title of *Jerub-baal justified*? since (pardon me)
you rather go about to build, than (*Gideon*-like) to throw down *Baals*
Altar in that Book: And think not (*Dear Sir*) that I have here shut up
private *Dogmaticals* under a *Med'ian-Persian Irreveribility* with an
ipse dixi, or a — *what I have written, I have written*; no, I am ready
upon contrary conviction (which (yet) I expect not) to write a *Recog-
nition* with *Bellarmino*, or with *St. Augustine*, a *Retraction*: In the
mean time, that the *Trumpet* may no longer give an uncertain sound,
is wished and (I would say) hoped, by, *SIR*,

Your Son and

Fellow-Sufferer.

T. P.

FINIS.